JUL 31 1930

The New REPUBLIC

Published Weekly

Wednesday July 30, 1930

CHARLES A. BEARD
Money in National Politics

Is Germany Safe for Democracy?
EDITORIAL

The Future in Palestine
by H. N. BRAILSFORD

Beautiful Old Things
by EDMUND WILSON

Boulder Dam
by F. L. BIRD

FIFTEEN CENTS A COPY

FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR

VOL. LXIII. NO. 817

Entered as Second Class matter December 5, 1914 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879

THEATRES

"MIGHTIEST WAR DRAMA EVER SEEN" N. Y. American.

ALL QUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT

A Universal Picture—Presented by Carl Laemmle

Directed by Lewis Milestone

"A notable achievement, sincere, earnest, vivid and graphic. Better than anything so far done." *Mordaunt Hall, N. Y. Times.*

"Enormously compelling talking motion picture. As a show something to get definitely excited about! A very fine motion picture. —*Howard Barnes, Herald Tribune.*

CENTRAL Theatre, Broadway and 47th Street
Twice Daily, 2:45—8:45
3 times, Saturday and Sunday, 2:45—5:45—8:45

THEATRE GUILD PRESENTS

THE NEW

GARRICK GAIETIES

GUILD THEA., 52nd Street, West of Broadway. Eves., 8:30. Matinees, Thurs. and Sat., 2:30

RKO COOL CAMEO 42nd St. & B'way

ALL WEEK
Begin Fri. July 25

Remarkable! Amazing! Real!

THE LAW OF THE SIBERIAN TAIGA

Newest Sovkino drama . . . a chronicle of the TUNGUS tribe in the frozen wastes of Siberia. . . . battling for life . . . fighting for food!

SUMMER PLACE

Hospitality that is unique.
It brings back friends year after year.

Western View Farm

New Milford, Conn.
83 miles from Columbus Circle

Telephone: New Milford 400

Elevation 1,000 feet Eleventh Season

Rates: $8 a day; $49 a week

Riding Swimming Tennis

Interesting People

BOOK

Public Ownership on Trial

by FREDERICK L. BIRD and FRANCES M. RYAN

Foreword by DR. JOHN BAUER

"Mr. Bird and Miss Ryan have done an honest and thorough piece of research. . . . The student of the present American power controversy ought not to neglect the book."—*The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.*

75 cents a copy, postpaid. Order from

THE NEW REPUBLIC
421 West 21st Street New York City

Do your part for humanity

HELP CONTROL CANCER

—tell people that cancer in its early stages is curable, in its late stages is not curable.

The odds are always against your having cancer—but make sure. Consult your physician yourself, urge others to do so.

This work is made possible by generous public support of the sale of the little Christmas book and by voluntary contributions. Our work for 1930 depends on your continued help.

For further information and free literature, address

THE NEW YORK CITY COMMITTEE
American Society for the Control of Cancer
34 EAST 75TH STREET, NEW YORK

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 1930 NUMBER 817

Contents

The Week 299

Editorials

Is Germany Safe for Democracy? 301
Will Iraq Go Free? 303

General Articles

Money in Federal Politics ..... Charles A. Beard 305
Sweet Oath in Mallorca (verse) .. John Galsworthy 307
The Future in Palestine ..... H. N. Brailsford 308
Who Will Benefit by Boulder Dam? .... F. L. Bird 310
Beautiful Old Things ..... Edmund Wilson 313
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 317

Correspondence 318

Reviews of Books

Classmates ..... Robert Morss Lovett 321
Llewelyn Powys ..... Arthur Colton 322
A Hebrew Scholastic ..... Paul Weiss 323
The Russian Theater ..... Harold Clurman 324
Bolívar ..... E. Munguía, Jr. 324
Notes on Novels 325

The Week

RATIFICATION of the Treaty of London by a vote of fifty-eight to nine in the Senate indicates how completely the public and the Senators saw through the case made against it by the opposition. While arguing that the agreement failed to allot us enough by a few cruisers or a few heavy guns, the navalists really desired the failure of any international limitation. They well knew that if chief emphasis were placed upon the technical details which they were discussing, and if the naval experts of each nation were allowed a decisive voice in the fixing of respective naval needs, no agreement would ever be possible. There would be no limit to naval expansion. The significance of the decisive vote is that the nation has once and for all rejected this policy. It has started on the path of limitation by agreement, and will not turn back. The step now taken in that direction is a short one, but the choice of the direction is of tremendous importance. We are glad, too, that the Senate rejected the amendment pledging that we should build up to the full Treaty strength. That question can be discussed later. The next problem is how to turn this victory to good account by further agreements to limit which will mean actual reduction, not more millions to be wasted in engines of devastation.

WHEN the new tariff law went into effect, Senator Jim Watson predicted that thirty days later the country would be prosperous. His thirty days are up; industry is certainly no better off and agriculture is very much worse. We therefore warmly invite Senator Jim to resign and go home on the ground of gross mental incompetence.

THE congressional investigation of Communist activities in the United States does not yet indicate that the republic is about to fall. Indeed, its discoveries are a melange of the commonplace, the dubious and the absurd. The Reds have attempted to control and disrupt trade unions. True; but, as the witnesses testified, the unions have successfully resisted the assault. The unions which were attacked are not asking Congress to outlaw Communists; on the contrary, some of them favor Russian recognition. And if it is a crime to attack unions, what about the guilt of American employers? The Communists are attempting to exploit the wrongs of underpaid labor, the unemployed, oppressed Negroes, disinherited farmers. True again; but they have not had much success, and such charges, from representatives of a government which has done nothing effective about unemployment or the farm depression, sound more like an advertisement of capitalist failure than a demonstration of Red wickedness. The Communists maintain secret agents in this country, and turn over money to their American affiliates through the Russian trading organization. The documents on which these charges rest are of doubtful authenticity, but if, as is likely, something of the sort is true, what of it? Money spent here for foreign propaganda is something to which we are well inured; such propaganda is more dangerous when its nature is better concealed than the arguments of the Russians. Having broadcast their fearful discoveries, the timorous Congressmen at last accounts had gone, well protected by state troopers, to inspect the children at Communist summer camps, in order to verify the report that they are impolite to each other at meal time, saying, "Damn it, pass the bread!"

IT IS well that the Senate has adjourned without confirming the President's three appointees to the new Federal Power Commission. The names are little known, and the importance of the job is such that it should be entrusted only to men whose competence is well assured. Investigation may reveal that these choices are justified, but the Senate was unwilling to remain in session long enough for the necessary inquiry. Under the old law, the Commission was composed of the Secretaries of War, Agriculture and the Interior. But they had not sufficient time to devote to its duties, and the delegation of work to subordinates, combined with inadequate funds, produced unsatisfactory results. In at least one recent case, the power interests which were supposed to be regulated obtained the appointment of their own man as Executive Secretary of the Commission. In addition to the functions of the Commission under the Water Power Act of 1920, it is likely to have new duties in regulating holding companies or interstate sale of power. It can be taken for granted that the private power interests will exert every ounce of their great influence to make sure of sympathetic appointments. Their first move in this direction was the President's tentative nomination, as chairman of the Commission, of General Jadwin—whose name was promptly withdrawn when the force of the opposition which it would arouse in the Senate was made known to Mr. Hoover. The public must be careful to see that they do not slip in another unsuitable man at a moment when it is inattentive.

WITH unusual speed and a minimum of bickering the anthracite operators and the United Mine Workers have renewed their agreement, which is to continue nearly five and a half years. The union was successful, not only in retaining the existing wage rate, but in establishing the check-off—the system by which the employers collect union dues and transmit them to the organization treasury. In exchange for this, the union consented to an arrangement by which wages may be modified during the life of the agreement, by arbitration. The existing joint machinery for continuous adjustment and for coöperative effort to advance the industry is strengthened, and is empowered to engage expert assistance in its problems. When one remembers the horrified moral objections to the check-off which the operators expressed when it was demanded a few years ago, one is inclined to smile at the change wrought by time. Indeed, the reasonableness of both sides has undoubtedly been increased by the precarious status of the industry, which, though retaining its former monopoly of the hard-coal supply, is no longer in a position to dictate to the consumer on account of the greatly increased competition of other fuels for house heating—oil, coke, gas, and even soft coal as burned by modern furnaces. And the willingness of the operators to assure the authority of the union through the check-off was probably increased by the split among the soft-coal miners and the rise of a new and possibly more radical organization.

A RECENT ruling by Attorney-General Mitchell that military tactics "is an optional and not a compulsory course in land-grant colleges" will immensely help the fight against militarism in education. Most of the great state universities come under the law of 1862, which offered federal aid to states establishing educational institutions which should include courses in agriculture, engineering and military tactics. Under the National Defense Act of 1920 the military courses were taken over by the War Department. Most colleges have interpreted the law to mean that all students must take them. But many students have protested against this compulsion, and ugly controversies have resulted. The objection was directed not merely against the meaningless irksomeness of military drill, but against the militaristic spirit and the reactionary social and political doctrines introduced into the courses. The growth of the peace movement, the international renunciation of war and the limitation of armament have increased the protest, not only among students, but among civic, religious, labor and farm organizations. Finally the legislature of Wisconsin placed military training in the state university on an optional basis. The Department of the Interior, which administers the land-grant funds, ruled that this was not contrary to the law, and the Attorney-General has now sustained the Department. University officials throughout the country are henceforth free to offer military instruction merely to those who want it.

WILD tales of atrocities which were so generally and hysterically circulated during the Great War have left us all a little chary of believing the stories of police brutality which drift over to us from India. But a report which was printed in Young India and said to have been written by an Englishwoman, the daughter of an English admiral, seems so well authenticated that one can hardly refuse to believe it. This Englishwoman visited the hospital at Bulsa just after the "raid" upon the salt pans at Dharasana. After interviewing the doctors and nurses there, she reports that the following methods were employed by the police to disperse the gathering: (1) *lathi* blows on head, chest, stomach, joints; (2) thrusts with *lathis* in private parts, abdominal regions, chest, etc.; (3) stripping men naked before beating; (4) tearing off loincloth and thrusting stick into anus; (5) pressing and squeezing testicles until victim became unconscious; (6) dragging wounded men by arms and legs, meanwhile beating them; (7) throwing wounded men into thorn hedges or into salt water; (8) riding horses over men as they lay or sat on the ground; (9) thrusting pins and thorns into men's bodies; (10) beating men after they had become unconscious. Even the doctors and nurses, usually callous to the spectacle of human suffering,

were aghast at the evidences of police brutality. "The beating and torturing," said one of the doctors, "has been most merciless today." The whole report is another proof of the fact that the English are using every method within their power to crush the Indian rebellion.

AS THE time approaches for the convening of the Grand Jury of Cook County to consider the murder of Lingle, the reporter of The Chicago Tribune, the suspicion takes definite form that, as three years ago in the case of McSwiggin, the murdered assistant state's attorney, the jury will merely be taken on an entertaining tour around Robin Hood's Barn. The only difference is that Crowe, then state's attorney, was a cleverer leader than Swanson, who now holds the office. Swanson, however, has Major Rathbun, attorney for The Chicago Tribune, to assist him. Already a number of lively red herrings have been drawn across the trail. A St. Louis reporter, Mr. Harry T. Brundidge, has made a statement, copied by The Chicago Tribune, to the effect that other Chicago papers have their Lingles. A reporter of The Daily News was attacked the other day, and his connection established with one Rosenheim, a professional informer who was murdered some months ago. It has also developed that the city editor of The Chicago American was a guest of Al Capone at Miami, and flew with his party to Havana, where a good time was had by all except the editor, who went to bed at curfew. Apparently The Tribune is trying to reëstablish the solidarity of the Chicago papers, loudly asserted when Lingle was killed. Then the basis was the purity and independence of the press in its war on crime. Now it is something else.

THERE are, meanwhile, a few points which the average citizen might paste in his hat for future reference. First, Chicago's municipal government is rotten from top to bottom and the citizens give every appearance of liking it that way. Second, bootlegging, gambling and prostitution earn such huge profits in Chicago, as in every other large city in this country, that bribery is well nigh inevitable. If the present gangs were dislodged there is every reason to suppose that others would quickly take their place. Third, The Chicago Tribune's outbursts of civic virtue should be checked against the fact that former Police Commissioner Russell was generally supposed to be The Tribune's man. Russell had joint brokerage accounts with Lingle, sometimes amounting to as much as $100,000 at a time, and hastily resigned his post as soon as this fact was made public. It had long been charged that newspaper influence was behind his refusal to stop children from selling papers on the streets at night. The newspapers of Chicago, as a matter of fact, were responsible for giving the first big start to gangsters in their city, when they imported rival troupes of plug-uglies years ago to keep one another's vendors off the streets. The papers are not, however, the real authority behind Mayor Thompson. In so far as anyone is the uncrowned king of Chicago, it is Samuel Insull, the public-utility magnate, whose personal counsel, Samuel A. Ettelson, is virtually mayor while Thompson is incapacitated.

Is Germany Safe for Democracy?

THE SITUATION in Germany is serious but not critical. It will become critical, if at all, only when the new Reichstag convenes after the election on September 14. Should this body follow the example of its predecessor which has just been dissolved by President von Hindenburg, and refuse to vote the government's financial bills, consequences of the greatest possible importance may follow.

The Müller Government, which preceded that of Bruening, fell on March 27 of this year because of its inability to agree on a financial program. Germany's economic condition has long been serious. Her trade has been depressed, she has had 2,000,000 unemployed (the equivalent of 4,000,000 in the United States), and her government is faced with a prospective budgetary deficit of $125,000,000. The government which Dr. Bruening formed when the Müller regime came to an end was a hodge-podge of parties from the Center. The Social Democrats, the strongest group in the Reichstag, were excluded. The Bruening "conservative-bourgeois" coalition included representatives of the Catholic Center and the Democratic, Economic and Bavarian People's parties, plus one "Tory Democrat" and one Nationalist. No sooner had the Bruening Government been installed than President von Hindenburg officially authorized the new chancellor to dissolve the Reichstag in case he failed to receive a vote of confidence. The President at that time mentioned Article 48 of the Constitution, under which the Government is now in fact carrying on. This article gives the President dictatorial powers "if public safety and order be seriously disturbed or threatened." It is very unlikely that the framers of the Constitution had in mind any such contingency as has just existed—one produced by the opposition of a majority in the Reichstag to passing the legislation necessary to make the payments under the Young Plan. However, the action of the President in dissolving the Reichstag is legal, and even if it were not, it is hard to see how it could be contested, short of a violent and altogether improbable revolution.

Pending the election of September 14, President von Hindenburg and Chancellor Bruening will carry on the government between them. They will put into effect the budget which the late Reichstag failed to pass, and will adopt the hated finan-

cial measures necessary under the Young Plan. They have about two months' time in which to try to bring the country to their point of view. In their favor is the fact that the rejection of the government's measures by the Reichstag was by a narrow vote—236 to 221—and was due to the last-minute defection of the wild and irresponsible Nationalist leader, Hugenberg, and fourteen of his followers. Against them is the fact that the country as a whole is at present opposed to the taxation program, and that the next Reichstag is likely to be more extremist than the last. There is in Germany a drift toward the extreme Right and the extreme Left, toward Fascism and Communism. These parties, the so-called "National Socialist" and the Communist, are almost certain to have their present representation heavily increased. What will then happen? Will the Reichstag again reject the legislation and will President von Hindenburg once more dismiss its members and call for still another general election?

In this situation, the attitude of the allies, and particularly of France, is of paramount importance. When the Young Plan was adopted, specific new measures were provided in case of a voluntary default by Germany. It was agreed that if the reparation payments were decreased below the agreed amount, or were halted, the matter should be submitted to the World Court to determine whether Germany's action was deliberate or involuntary. If it were decided to be deliberate, the "Creditor Powers" stated that they would "resume their full liberty of action." But liberty to do what? France has just withdrawn the last of her troops from the Rhineland, and would be reluctant to invade Germany again, if only for the effect upon world public opinion. The debates in the French Chamber over the adoption of the Young Plan indicated the course that would be taken. The decision of the World Court that Germany's default was deliberate would be laid before the Council of the League, which would be asked to take jurisdiction on the ground that Germany, a member of the League, was willfully breaking a solemn international agreement. Decisions of the League Council have to be unanimous, and if this proved impossible, France would be free to act alone. She would, however, M. Tardieu explained to the Chamber, always remember her obligations under the Kellogg Pact.

The French are speaking to Germany in far softer tones than they used a few years ago. For this there are several reasons, of which Italy is one of the strongest. A large and increasing number of people in France believe that there is grave danger of a war with Italy. They are not seriously concerned about the outcome of such a war, provided that only those two powers participated; but they are deeply apprehensive about the danger of an alliance or a series of alliances directed against themselves. A grim and silent struggle for dominance is going on between French and Italian representatives throughout southeastern Europe, particularly in Hungary and Rumania. This struggle also exists in regard to Germany. It is not necessary to take seriously the recent alarmist reports from Berlin of a German-Italian alliance to recognize that French diplomacy is here faced by a difficult task.

The attitude of the German people, which caused the adverse vote in the Reichstag on the financial measures necessary to carry out the Young Plan, and is likely to send to the next Reichstag a still larger number of extremists, is based not only on their natural dislike of higher taxes and lower domestic expenditures, but also on their opposition to reparations. The majority of the Germans do not believe the theory under which they are compelled to pay—namely, that their country was solely responsible for the beginning of the War. They believe, what responsible historians in all countries now accept as the truth, that most of the chief European powers must share the responsibility. If the Allies had said to them, "We won and you must pay," the Germans could have understood. But naturally, when payment is made conditional upon moral responsibility, the logical Teuton feels that with the demonstrated disappearance of his sole guilt it is time for payments to cease. Europe is now seen to be what in fact it has been all the time—two groups of nations in bitter opposition to each other. One group, headed by France, wants the territorial and financial provisions of the treaties of 1919 retained at any cost. The other, headed by Germany, wants them revised to rectify the injustices they contain.

That the treaties ought to be revised no impartial observer can be in doubt. The question is whether the attempt should be a forcible one, or should be made through the machinery of diplomatic negotiations, the League of Nations and the World Court. As to this, there can be no two answers. The attempt to use forcible measures would not only violate all the agreements of the League, Locarno and the Kellogg Pact, but it would in all probability bring on another general war, with consequences disastrous from every point of view, and no guarantee that it would not end in a situation where the present victims of injustice would find themselves worse off. Even the effort, on the part of Germany alone, to offer passive resistance is likely to produce a conflict which would leave her people, and those of every other European country, in a far worse plight than now. This has been the opinion of all the German governments of recent years, and their record of success justifies the conclusion that they have been right. The last foreign soldier has left German soil, five years before the final date set in the Treaty. The reparations payments have been reduced by three-quarters from the fantastic sums originally demanded. The cash value of the existing obligation, at 5.5 percent, is now a little more than eight billion dollars, but it is likely that nothing like this amount (divided into

payments up to 1978) will ever be handed over.

The great question now is whether the comparatively successful policy Germany has hitherto pursued will be abandoned in favor of the far more dangerous one of action which may be interpreted as refusal to coöperate in the carrying out of the Young Plan. This is a question which will be answered only after the new Reichstag has convened. In the meantime, it is not a matter lightly to be dismissed, that even a temporary dictatorship should be established in the interest of budgetary reform, when the reform itself is necessitated by pressure on a vanquished nation to pay tribute to the victors. This is scarcely making the world safe for democracy.

Will Iraq Go Free?

WITHIN the past fortnight, a great deal has been seen in the press about the new treaty between Iraq and Great Britain. We have been told that the mandate which the British have held is about to come to an end and that Iraq will be an independent member of the League of Nations in another two years. Indeed, an occasional enthusiast is apt to paint for us an idyllic picture of a great Western power voluntarily relaxing its grasp upon a small Eastern one. Without wishing to seem too cynical, one may make several observations about this charming portrait. In the first place, the new treaty does not come into effect unless and until it is ratified by Iraq—which may be a long distance in the future. In the second place, it is probable that the terms of the treaty will be found to retain for Great Britain such a degree of control over Iraq—including a collaboration in her defense—that the two countries will still be closely linked together. And there is no danger, for instance, of any threat to the aerial communications between England and India, on which Bagdad is an important way-station. In the third place, the negotiation of the new treaty does not mean that England has lost her interest in Mesopotamian oil. The foreign control of the oil fields there is safeguarded by a quite separate seventy-five-year contract, which continues in force whatever are the political relations between the two governments.

Nevertheless, the signing of the treaty does represent a real achievement, and one, first of all, over the climate of Bagdad. Only those who have experienced summer temperatures in that city, and are aware how long the negotiations on Anglo-Iraqi relations have continued, can appreciate the victory over physical and metaphysical difficulties which the new treaty represents. It may be that the oft-quoted injunction in Islamic Holy Writ, "It is for them to take counsel together," was a prophetic allusion to the trials of modern Iraqi statesmen; at any rate successive Iraq governments have had to "take counsel" almost continuously—not, perhaps, because they were grimly devout, but because they were obstinately determined to gain the largest possible measure of independence for their country from British control sooner than they thought British officials would grant it of their own accord.

Iraq, it will be remembered, was occupied by the British during the War, at a heavy cost in lives and money, because Great Britain was determined to strengthen and consolidate its position in the Middle East, where Germany's Berlin-Bagdad railway project had been a threat in the years directly preceding the War. British interests in the Persian Gulf (patrolled by British sloops), British interests in the Persian oil fields (open to attack from an enemy entrenched in Iraq), British concern over the future development of the reputedly enormous oil reserves in Iraq itself—these were the considerations which made the gamble of the Mesopotamian campaign seem worth while in London.

It was in May, 1920, that Great Britain accepted an appointment by the Supreme Allied Council—later confirmed by the League Council at Geneva—to give Iraq administrative advice and assistance under the League mandate system until such time as the country was able to stand alone. The British government, in anticipation of this decision, had already been at work on a draft mandate under whose terms Iraq would be administered as "a sacred trust of civilization." Some of the communities of Iraq, however, did not want a British tutor, and in the latter part of 1920 an uprising against the British occurred which was not put down until British and Iraqi casualty lists, in killed and wounded, had exceeded ten thousand.

Even after order was restored and British authorities had placed on the throne of Iraq the Arab prince who had aided them most in Arabia and Syria against the Turks, the anti-mandate agitation continued. The Iraqis bound their new King by oath on the Koran never to give his assent to the mandate. The Constituent Assembly, too, was obdurate on the subject. Great Britain, therefore, adjusted itself to the situation. It withdrew the draft mandate which was to have been imposed on Iraq and substituted for it a bilateral treaty, with four subsidiary agreements, specifying the manner in which the administration was to be carried on during the next twenty-five years.

Although the treaty with the mandatory power set Iraq on a plane considerably above the neighboring mandated territories, the provisions of the treaty were themselves distasteful to the government and people in many respects. Thus, although Iraq was on bargaining terms with the occupying authorities, and although it had a Parliament and a Constitution, a King and a theoretically responsible Cabinet, it knew that British officials, from the High Commissioner and the Ministerial Advisers down to the Junior Finance and Police Inspectors, really determined from day to day the manner in which government was administered. The situation was frankly stated in a clause of the military agreement, which provided that Iraq would not be en-

titled to British military assistance in the face of any foreign attack or internal disturbance which the High Commissioner believed to have been brought about as a result of "action taken or policy pursued by the Iraq government contrary to the advice or express wishes of His Britannic Majesty's government." Under these circumstances it naturally behooved members of the Iraq government not to move without the sanction of the advisers accredited to them. They lived, as an Iraqi observer once put it, "in a Damoclean perpetual fright."

The new treaty, whose terms have not yet been officially published, is understood to recognize Iraq's "complete independence" and its sole responsibility for administration of its own affairs, the maintenance of internal security, "and, subject to the terms of the treaty, the defense of the country against foreign aggression."

Perhaps in principle the Nationalists have won their point that Iraq should be allowed to introduce military conscription and build up, at relatively little cost, a national army of respectable enough size to meet the needs of the country, thus relieving Great Britain of the burden of Iraq's defense. Iraq's present volunteer army is small and expensive, and when real work has had to be done it has been the British air force and the locally recruited levies maintained by the British taxpayer who have borne the brunt of the fighting. For four years successive Iraq governments have attempted to get British consent for the introduction of a conscription bill; for four years they have failed. The tribes, it was said, would oppose the measure. This was true. It may have been true, also, that Great Britain had not yet discovered a way in which it could guarantee the protection of its interests in the Middle East if the levies were disbanded and the air force called home.

Under the new treaty, the British air force will be concentrated in the southwestern part of Iraq, where it will be kept for the purpose of guaranteeing British imperial communications. This is an important matter because the semi-weekly flights offered between Cairo, Bagdad and Basra are only part of the London-to-India service of Imperial Airways, Ltd., over the longest organized commercial air route in the world today. When the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf are connected by rail, there will be additional work for the Royal Air Force to do, since nomad tribesmen will always have to be persuaded that trans-desert trains are not their legitimate prey.

The new treaty will probably not be ratified by the Iraq Parliament unless Nuri Pasha, the present Prime Minister, succeeds this summer in coming to some agreement in London with the Colonial Office on at least four other matters. This prophecy may be made with all the more assurance inasmuch as a widely heralded treaty negotiated and signed in 1927 subsequently dropped out of sight because no Iraq government would bring it before Parliament as long as Great Britain refused to revise the subsidiary agreements. The four questions still to be settled have to do with the ownership of the British-improved port of Basra, the transfer of the British-built Iraq railways to the government of Iraq, the reduction of the number of British officials in the country, and the fulfillment of the terms of the Iraq Petroleum Company's concession. The Iraq government has protested the valuation placed on the Iraq railways by the British government; it wishes to have the site of the Basra port registered in the name of Iraq instead of in the name of the Port Trust which is to manage it until Iraq's financial position is more secure; and it wishes to terminate the contracts of a number of well paid British officials whose positions Iraqis believe themselves qualified to fill at a quarter the salary. Moreover, it stands in dire need of the four-shillings-a-ton royalty which the Iraq Petroleum Company is to pay it when oil production actually begins. The company has not been keeping up to its time schedule, partly because of the overproduction of oil in other parts of the world, and the Iraq government is becoming anxious. The Iraq Petroleum Company is a powerful international consortium of British, American, French and Dutch interests, in which British capital slightly exceeds that of any of the other groups. This being the case, Nuri Pasha desires to come to an understanding with Great Britain as to how far Iraq should go in demanding the literal fulfillment of its contract by the Iraq Petroleum Company.

It is not anticipated that Iraq's admission to the League of Nations will be preceded or immediately followed by a complete withdrawal of British administrative control. After all, Panama, Cuba and Haiti are all members of the League, yet they all continue to stand in a special relationship to the United States. Iraq, if admitted, will probably find that it has something in common with these three countries. But its chief distinction will be that it was the first territory administered under the terms of Article 22 of the League Covenant which succeeded, with the consent of the mandatory power, in graduating from the supervision of the Permanent Mandates Commission and assuming the dignities of an independent state.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1930, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

Money in Federal Politics

PERIODICALLY the country is shocked by investigations revealing the expenditures of huge sums of money by candidates for Congress; these shocks have been intermittent since the close of the Civil War. A great deal of heat has been generated, escaping usually in talk, and Congress has skirted around the edges of the subject in several statutes. Generally speaking, "nothing has been done about it"; yet there are signs of change. Not long ago the Senate in the Vare case added a new qualification for membership in that body: a citizen presenting his election credentials to the Senate must show that he has not spent too much money in an irregular fashion in winning his seat. A short time before this significant incident, Senator Bronson Cutting forcibly raised the whole question of political expenditures in a searching speech in the Senate and introduced a program of legislation designed to cope with some of the worst evils in the present practices. Judging by his pertinacity, we may assume that Mr. Cutting will not let the matter rest and that Congress, in its next session, will have to face the issue of money in federal politics.

Under the prevailing system of popular elections, thousands and even millions of voters must be reached through various agencies, such as the press, meetings, the post, telegraph, radio and party workers. Huge expenditures are necessary even for legitimate purposes, to say nothing of bribery direct and indirect. To win party nominations for offices in large jurisdictions, individual aspirants and their supporters must ordinarily make considerable outlays of money, and to win elections, party organizations and candidates must do likewise, if they have any formidable competitors. Here the American theory of democratic equality absolutely breaks down in fact. Although it is not true that the longest purse always wins, it is certainly true that without a purse of some kind to aid him, no citizen can expect to win the office of President or a seat in Congress.

Ordinarily money for such expenditures comes from four prime sources—disinterested persons of wealth, office holders, office seekers and citizens with economic undertakings which may be benefited by action or inaction on the part of the government. Attempts to raise large sums through petty contributions by the masses are not usually crowned with success. Inevitably this brings about a concentration of immense power in the hands of a relatively small number of people. And recent investigations, not to say scandals, have revealed a widespread use of money by individuals and groups in primaries and elections—money derived from sources economically interested and sometimes expended in a fraudulent manner. In 1928 and 1929, two men were excluded from the United States Senate on the ground that their campaign expenditures were highly irregular, if not tainted with corruption. In recognition of such facts, the most advanced states have enacted elaborate campaign-practices laws and Congress has tardily but gingerly dealt with the subject.

Federal legislation in this field is of four types: First of all, Congress has imposed certain limits on the collecting and giving of money in connection with elections. According to the terms of a law originally passed in 1883, no Senator, Representative or federal officer may solicit or receive any contribution, subscription or assessment from any officer, clerk or other employee drawing a salary from the federal treasury. Thus, an effort was made to dry up one of the prime sources of political funds. Cut off from this assistance, political leaders came to rely more and more on the contributions of great financial and industrial corporations. To counter this movement, Congress has made it unlawful for any national bank or any corporation whatever to make any money contribution in connection with elections at which presidential and vice-presidential electors, Senators or Representatives are chosen; furthermore, candidates, political committees and all other persons are forbidden to receive any contributions from these sources.

While attempting to combat the collection of political funds from three interested groups in society—office holders, national banks and business corporations—Congress has placed limits on the amount which candidates for Congress may spend in elections. In no case can they exceed the sum set by state legislation in this relation. In the absence of a state law fixing a smaller figure, a candidate for the Senate may spend $10,000 and a candidate for the House of Representatives, $2,500. However, if the size of the constituency permits it, this amount may be increased to a figure obtained by multiplying by three cents the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the position in question—that is, for Senator, or Representative. Even then, no matter how large the vote, no candidate for the Senate may spend more than $25,000 and no candidate for the House more than $5,000.

But highly significant exceptions must be recorded. In summing up all his expenditures under the federal limit, a candidate may omit outlays for his necessary personal, traveling and subsistence expenses. He may likewise leave out of the reckoning money spent for stationery and postage, for distributing circulars and for telephone and tele-

graph service. Also excepted from the accounting are all assessments, fees and charges levied on him under the laws of the state in which he resides.

Meager as are the provisions of federal law on political contributions and candidates' expenditures, they are still more meager with respect to the purposes of outlays—the uses which may be made of money and other objects of value in elections. It is unlawful for any candidate for Congress to offer directly or indirectly any public or private employment in exchange for support, or to promise his influence to secure such employment on this condition. It is likewise unlawful to offer to make, or to cause to be made, any expenditures to any person with a view to inducing him to vote for or against any candidate or to withhold his vote. The acceptance as well as the offering of money for these purposes is also prohibited. In some measure, no doubt, the comparatively slight federal limitations on the uses of money are due to the fullness of state laws dealing with bribery and other corrupt practices in elections.

A further restraint on the collection and use of money is supposed to be afforded by a federal law providing for the publicity of campaign funds. Every candidate for Senator or Representative must file with the secretary of the Senate or the clerk of the House, as the case may be, both before and after election, a statement showing in detail contributions received in support of his candidacy and itemized expenditures made by him or by any person with his knowledge and consent. And, curiously enough, he must add a statement of pledges or promises made by himself, or with his consent, relative to offering public or private employment in exchange for support.

Besides requiring candidates for Congress to file reports of their outlays, the law prescribes publicity for political committees. Within the scope of the law is every committee, association and organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential or vice-presidential electors in two or more states. The law does not stop here. It also applies to every other committee, association or organization engaged in influencing elections, whether it operates in more than one state or not, if it is a branch or a subsidiary of a national committee, association or organization—excluding duly organized state and local committees of political parties. All political committees covered by this legislation must file periodically fully itemized statements containing receipts and expenditures. The list of outlays must show in great detail the purposes as well as the dates and amounts of the expenditures.

After the federal legislation respecting the use of money in elections was consolidated and amended in 1925, some of the most extraordinary scandals in the long history of campaign funds occurred. Coupled with independent criticism from the outside, the discussion of these scandals in Congress has raised anew the question of providing a complete national code regulating and restricting the use of money in politics. In this relation numerous deficiencies of the existing laws have been pointed out and remedial bills proposed.

Perhaps the greatest gap in federal legislation is the total exclusion of primaries from the scope of control. The publicity act of 1911 covered both primaries and elections, but the Supreme Court in the Newberry case in 1921 held that the power of Congress to regulate the manner of holding elections did not extend to senatorial conventions and primaries. Subsequently Congress, in consolidating the corrupt-practices acts, expressly provided that the term "election" does not include a primary election or convention of a political party. Yet it is doubtful whether this exception is required by the Constitution. In the Newberry case mentioned above, only four of the nine judges of the Supreme Court agreed that Congress had no power over primaries. Another judge joined them in holding invalid a part of the law enacted previous to the adoption of popular election of Senators, but reserved judgment as to whether the authority of Congress in this respect had not been increased by the subsequent change in the Constitution. Thus, in fact, the power of Congress over primaries and political conventions is clouded with uncertainty.

And yet in a large number of cases it is the primary, not the election, that counts in the choice of Senators and Representatives. Wherever one political party continuously dominates a state, as, for example, the Democrats in Alabama or the Republicans in Pennsylvania, the real fight is over the nomination; the election is secure. It has been estimated that in a majority of the congressional districts the chief contest is the primary. It was in the primaries in Pennsylvania and Illinois that a part of the enormous expenditure was incurred which led to the exclusion of two men from the Senate on grounds of corruption or misuse of money. To clear the way for federal control over primaries, an amendment to the Constitution has been proposed, vesting in Congress supervision over nominations as well as elections.

A second criticism of the present corrupt-practices legislation bears upon the clause which exempts from the limits fixed on expenditures money spent by candidates for stationery, postage, printing, personal uses and publicity in general (except for newspapers and billboards). Under this rule a candidate may spend as much as he pleases for effective campaigning—letters, telegrams and circulars, for instance. Thus, outlays for most of the purposes which may be called "legitimate" are in fact not at all restricted in amount, and the man or woman with a long purse is given a decided advantage.

Besides leaving the candidate absolutely free to spend as much as he likes for such publicity pur-

poses, the law allows his friends and supporters to spend all they please on his behalf without accounting for it. It is in this connection that some of the worst abuses have arisen. Frequently it is not the candidate but some powerful economic interest behind him that makes huge outlays in primaries and elections. As long as the candidate is not held personally responsible for all expenditures in support of his candidacy in primaries and elections, and the amount not strictly limited, wealth has a decided advantage in every contest.

Through another hole in the corrupt-practices law money may creep. Political committees may have large deficits in their funds at the end of the campaign and raise the money to meet these deficits long after the period for making public their accounts of the election has expired. As Senator Cutting once remarked: "A contribution made to a preëlection fund would have been in the nature of a gamble, but a contribution made to a deficit, and particularly to a deficit of the party which had been successful in the election, was simply putting . . . money over the counter and getting a return for his investment. That is a danger which is not dealt with under our present statutes at all." This practice was illustrated in connection with the campaign of 1920, when a big deficit in the Republican fund was covered by Mr. Harry Sinclair, who was later charged with fraudulently obtaining oil leases from the politicians who benefited from his campaign contributions. Mr. Sinclair stated at the time that he did not know whether he was a Republican or a Democrat, but at all events he staked his money on the winning horse.

In addition to its structural defects, the corrupt-practices law is weak on the side of enforcement. The provisions for publicity are not effective. Statements of campaign receipts and expenditures are carelessly filed in irregular form, they are not published, and after a period of two years they may be destroyed. Most of them merely accumulate dust. Eager newspaper reporters may dig out certain figures that will make news or a sensation, but as a rule candidates and committees can be fairly sure that little will be heard or known of their "public" statements. While the national committees of the great political parties report in detail, other political committees and many candidates for Congress are, to say the least, extremely careless in making their returns. It is doubtful whether the news of their publicity statements often reaches their respective districts. In this relation the law has no teeth.

Furthermore, no agency is responsible for enforcing its terms. A defeated candidate may attack his opponent in the federal courts for some infraction, but there is no permanent machinery to investigate charges of irregularity. Committees on elections in both houses of Congress and special committees for inquiring into campaign expenditures do go into specific cases as they arise, or make hurried searches when scandal breaks out, but they are almost always partisan in character and concerned primarily with immediate issues. It is not the business of any non-political federal officer or agency to maintain constant scrutiny over the operations of the election laws.

From these criticisms it follows that any thoroughgoing revision of the corrupt-practices acts should include primaries and conventions as well as elections within the scope of the law. It should fix limits to all expenditures, define the purposes for which they may be made, place full responsibility for expenditures on candidates and committees and abolish exemptions in accounting for campaign outlays. If publicity is to be more than a farce, then provisions must be made for giving effect to it in a form that will reach the voters. Deficits present a knotty problem, but committees that incur them can be made accountable and conditions may be prescribed for meeting unpaid bills. With reference to the issue of enforcement, Senator Cutting has proposed the creation of an election commission to audit reports, investigate credentials, deal with contested cases, serve as a fact-finding body, and report results of its inquiries to Congress for final determination.

If the defects in the present laws are cured by new legislation, the problem of money in politics will not be entirely solved. Indeed, there are Senators who hold that it cannot be solved until the use of private money in primaries and elections is forbidden entirely. But this involves heroic action. Especially does it throw upon the federal government the burden of providing machinery by which all aspirants and candidates may present their claims to constituents on an even plane at public expense. It will take more thought than has yet been expended on the subject to evolve a scheme that will place the long head on a parity with the long purse. Perhaps it can and may be done. But no matter what restraints the law may put on the use of money in politics, it cannot by that process separate politics and economics.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

Sweet Oath in Mallorca

If you had, suddenly, been where I've been
Under the sun among the almond flowers,
If you had dreamed and seen what I have seen—
The old gray olives and the old gray towers;
If, in bewitchment, there had come to you
Over the hills, beneath the evening star,
The tinkling of the sheepbells, or, the blue
Gleaming from where the happy wild flowers are;
If you'd been wafted to that fairyland,
And in delight been lost and lost again,
And, walking with me, waved a friendly hand
To children smiling with the eyes of Spain,
And in full day beheld the young moon fly—
Then had you sworn the same sweet oath as I.

JOHN GALSWORTHY.

The Future in Palestine

NEARLY a year has passed since the Arab mob in Palestine made its third attempt to destroy the Jewish National Home by massacre. The first response of the British Labor Government to this challenge was salutary and prompt. It seemed to realize that its officials had failed in the first duty of every civilized administration, and it took prompt steps, by increasing the garrison and reorganizing the unreliable police, to assure order for the future. Its handling of the larger political problem, however, arouses the deepest anxiety. One can quote, both from Mr. MacDonald's utterances and from the official speeches of the Under-secretary for the Colonies, Dr. Drummond Shiels, at Geneva, words which recognize frankly and even generously the duty of the Mandatory Power to promote the settlement of the Jews in Palestine. With these words the acts of the Labor Government seem in flagrant contradiction. In fact, it seems to be flinching before the difficulties of its task. It is asking questions which imply a doubt whether the policy of the Mandate is practicable. Ten years after the League of Nations instructed the Mandatory Power to promote the close settlement of Jewish immigrants upon the land, the government has sent an expert, Sir John Hope Simpson, to report to it whether, in fact, land is available for this purpose. Its doubts are evidently so serious that it has, in the meantime, suspended all Jewish immigration. This is manifestly a political decision, for to the British officials on the spot it appeared that the economic outlook would warrant an appreciable addition to the Jewish population, and they had sanctioned the entry of no less than 2,300 immigrants. There is, in fact, a scarcity of labor, and on a small scale, Arab workers are actually being recruited in Egypt. Nothing is decided, but everything is in suspense. No British government will ever in plain words repudiate the policy of the Mandate. The ideal of the National Home is sacred. But the Jews have some warrant for their bitter question: Is it to be a home without land or men?

Behind this hesitation lies a tangled and difficult controversy. It is probable that the British statesmen who adopted the Zionist ideal during the most anxious crisis of the World War gave little thought to the attitude of the Arabs. They wished to win Jewish support for the Allied cause, and they meant to establish in Palestine a strategical outpost for the defense of the Suez Canal. For the rest, they were doubtless sincere—as the mass of British opinion certainly was—in feeling that Christendom owed some reparation to this martyred people. In the lower temperature of peace this generous impulse has faded: we do not stand so urgently in need of Jewish support as we did when the Germans threatened Amiens, and our realists perceive that with an Arab state in Palestine we could conclude a strategical alliance, as we have done with Iraq and are fain to do with Egypt. In this mood men count the difficulties and discover a conscience that begins to be sensitive about Arab rights. It is a fact that, with or without reason, the Arab population is opposed, root and branch, to the whole conception of the Jewish National Home.

That to some minds is decisive, and they appeal to the doctrine of self-determination. Has not this Arab population, which has been settled in Palestine for almost as long as the Anglo-Saxon stock in England, an inherent right to dispose of its own destinies? The Wilsonian doctrine stands in need of closer definition than busy politicians usually give it. Do we really mean that any people, however backward, which has squatted on a territory, however fertile, has a right to monopolize it to the exclusion of all others? Does no question arise as to whether it is making a full use of that territory's resources? The doctrine does well to oppose the claim of empires to override, in their own interest, the will of weaker populations. But must there not be in the general society of mankind a right to override the local will for the general good? On that assumption, the League of Nations acted. It saw a territory which once had sustained a high culture neglected, impoverished, sparsely peopled. It saw in the decadent and backward Arabs of today no promise of development. It knew that the Jews, because of their passionate love for the cradle of their race, would spend upon it all the resources of their talents, their idealism and their wealth. It gave the Mandate that they might have some land which they could call their own, and in which they could build up a focus for their culture. It directed the Mandatory to promote this ideal, but it made him at the same time the guardian of Arab rights.

Charged with this dual role, the Mandatory finds himself in a delicate and embarrassing position. Broadly, in their civil and religious rights and in their economic interests, the Arabs have not suffered. On the contrary, they have profited by the immense stimulus which the immigration of Jewish brains, labor and capital has brought with it. The country has progressed in this decade at a pace which no Eastern land has ever before experienced. Electric power from the Jordan is the basis for flourishing new industries. Transport has been modernized. Whole regions which were malarious deserts supporting a few impoverished shepherds are today drained, afforested and planted with orchards, which support a closely settled agricul-

tural population. The general standard of life has risen, and with it the level of real wages. There is now a revenue from taxation which supports an educational system. The hospitals which the Jews have created are open to their Arab neighbors. The market value, even of derelict land in Arab ownership, has risen enormously, and it is significant that in these new conditions of comparative well-being, the Arab population increases more rapidly than in any of the neighboring lands.

All this may be true, but these economic gains have done nothing to lessen the Arab opposition to Jewish immigration and enterprise. The Mandatory Power faces the future, and asks whether he must shoulder the burden of the troublesome occupation forever. The pulse of British imperialism beats more feebly since the War. For direct rule over Eastern peoples there is today but little appetite. Egypt would be effectively independent were it not for a barely intelligible controversy over the Sudan. Iraq has accepted her status as an independent ally. Even in India, imperialism is fighting nothing more than a delaying action against the inevitable. The whole tendency of our Eastern policy seems to forbid a permanent, or even a prolonged, stay in Palestine.

Yet with what conscience could we retire? It is certain that on the day that we conceded self-government, the Arab majority would use its control of the administrative machine, not merely to arrest the growth of Jewish enterprise and immigration, but to undermine and destroy all that has been achieved. One can suggest safeguards which might check the grosser and more brutal methods of destruction, but it is difficult to imagine conditions under which the Jewish National Home could thrive in an independent Arab state. The dilemma then presents itself in this form: Are we to stay indefinitely until the Jewish element is numerous enough and prosperous enough to take care of itself? Or shall we check the whole uncomfortable experiment, arrest its growth, and build the Home as a cottage so modest, on a site so restricted, that at last the Arabs will lose their fears and consent to leave the harmless little thing alone? In that event, we might retire, blessing the miniature which faintly recalled the distant hour when we cherished a grandiose and generous purpose.

The dilemma is never presented in these crude terms. One can read it, none the less, clearly enough in the report of the Shaw Commission, which seems to have had so surprising an influence on the policy of the Labor Government. Though it was charged with the limited task of inquiring into the disturbances of last August, the majority went far beyond this subject, and in effect questioned the whole policy of the Mandate. In its view the discontent of the Arabs was due to their fear that Jewish immigration would deprive them of their livelihood and that Jewish colonization would create a landless Arab proletariat, while this illiterate population was represented as a race of keen politicians, panting for democratic self-government. The corrective was supplied in an able minority report by the one Labor member of the Commission, Mr. Harry Snell. In his view, the disturbances arose from a deliberately manufactured agitation, conducted by the Arab gentry, who from first to last played on the fanaticism of their co-religionists and roused them to frenzy by their pretenses that the Moslem Holy Places were in danger.

Direct evidence that economic grievances played a part in inciting the mob to massacre there is none. To render that theory plausible, the Commission had to construct from its own processes of divination a picture of what it supposed must be passing through the mass mind of the Arabs. Had it taken the trouble to analyze the Arab press, a wholly different picture would have resulted. It is significant that 90 percent of the Jewish casualties occurred, not in the new agricultural Zionist settlement at all, but among the old Orthodox population in Jerusalem, Hebron and Safed. Any evidence of Arab unemployment seemed to relate only to seasonal scarcity of work, inevitable in an agricultural country. Over the question of whether, in fact, any appreciable number of Arab cultivators displaced by Jewish settlement, had failed to find other land, the witnesses were in direct conflict, and one can only say that the Jewish evidence which rebutted this contention was conjectural and vague. Certainly, in every such case, the Jews paid compensation to tenants with which they might have purchased land and stock. Two facts which bear on this controversy are often ignored. In the first place, only one-third of the total volume of Jewish immigration goes to the land; the rest is absorbed in works of construction, and in the new industries which are making of Palestine the most progressive manufacturing center of the East. In the second place, if there is in fact a shortage of land, that is due to the wholly arbitrary decision which closed the part of Palestine beyond the Jordan to Jewish settlement. Transjordania has much the more fertile land, a much bigger uncultivated area and far sparser population. If it is to be closed to Jewish immigrants, the reasonable course would seem to be to assist any landless Arab proletariat that may exist to migrate to its open spaces.

An agrarian problem there certainly is. Palestine can support a larger rural population only by a transition from the incredibly backward and wasteful farming of today to intensive cultivation, under irrigation, with oranges rather than wheat as the staple crop. It is not enough that the Jews should introduce scientific methods on their own estates. Case after case has proved that science, on this parched but potentially fruitful soil, will enable 2,500 Jews (as in Rehoboth) to live well, where before a dozen Arabs lived miserably. Very slowly, around the Jewish settlements, the Arabs are be-

ginning to learn from their example. But if the land is to make room for a rapidly expanding Jewish colonization, it is plain that these slow-moving, illiterate peasants must be taught and helped to adopt rational methods. The majority argues that any further Jewish immigration must involve the disturbance of these people's traditional way of life, and in some cases the dispersal of their tribes.

There, truly, is the whole issue. Has civilization the right to hustle a backward people out of its medieval slumbers, secure in the knowledge that when their inertia is overcome, they will be abler, happier, healthier and wealthier for the change, and that the world's sum of goods will be increased? To those of us who answer "yes," the majority, which wishes to check, if not to stop, Jewish immigration, will seem to be wrong. Mr. Snell, on the other hand, will seem to be right, for he urges that the real solution lies in the transformation of Arab farming, by education and the provision of credit. If this British administration would do for the Arab farmers what the Anglo-Indian administration has done for the Sikhs in the Punjab by coöperative marketing and irrigation, the agrarian problem would cease to be an obstacle to Jewish immigration. The heaviest criticism against the British administration is not that it failed to build up a reliable police. It is rather that it took its task in too passive and uncreative a spirit.

It ought to have realized that a population living and working in the dark ages cannot coexist happily with a population living and working in the twentieth century. Only if it can lift the Arab peasant to a level somewhere near that of his Jewish neighbor can Palestine become a habitable home for both races. Mr. Snell's proposal for a careful survey of land and agriculture, district by district, would have measured the possibilities. An inevitably hasty inquiry by a single expert called in from outside does not serve the same end. One cannot wonder that the Jews refuse to stake the whole future of their great experiment on one man's verdict.

Is there then no political problem? Assuredly, the small landed class will never acquiesce in the entry of a stirring race, whose intelligence and resources threaten their leadership. The extremer Zionists may have provoked its opposition needlessly by advertising their ambition to become the majority of the Palestinian population. No race would submit quietly to a slow conquest by numbers, bloodless though it may be. The wiser objective is to think of the National Home rather as a focus for Jewish culture than as a national state. With this Arab aristocracy compromise will be difficult. The hope of the future lies rather in detaching the Arab masses from its leadership by education and agrarian reform. But peace will not come to Palestine so long as the British government visibly hesitates and shrinks before the difficulties of its task. Civilization must not yield to massacre.

H. N. Brailsford.

Who Will Benefit by Boulder Dam?

DOWN IN Washington the Secretary of the Interior has been engaged in selling a million horsepower of electrical energy to finance the building of the Boulder Dam, on which actual work began a few days ago. Three million people in the Pacific Southwest have watched the negotiations anxiously and hopefully, for control of the menacing Colorado holds forth to them the promise of security and progress.

The act adopted by Congress for the construction of the dam made it a self-financing project. The act specified that no work should be undertaken until contracts for the sale of water and power at the dam site, adequate not only to cover the cost of operation and maintenance, but also to repay with interest the entire cost of construction within a period of fifty years, were in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. While some revenue will be derived from the sale of water, it is upon the sale of power, or power-development rights, that the financing of the huge project chiefly depends.

There was, in recent months, some dampening of the enthusiasm of those who were waiting for the actual construction of the dam, by the pontifical announcement of certain utility magnates that no one would care to buy the power. The fact that these assertions emanated from the same interests that long opposed the undertaking of the project by the government served to minimize their seriousness; but it was, nevertheless, true that conditions in the principal market for Boulder Canyon power, the metropolitan area of Los Angeles, had undergone an amazing change.

The value of Boulder Dam power, under present conditions, is determined, not by the cost of undeveloped hydro-electric power sites tributary to Los Angeles, but by the cost of producing power in large modern steam generating stations using cheap natural gas or oil for fuel. Overproduction in nearby fields has reduced the price of the gas equivalent of a barrel of fuel oil to as low as fifty cents, and has cut almost in half the cost of generating power in the Los Angeles area. Thus, it was easy for intentionally short-sighted corporation gentlemen to view with alarm the prospects for Boulder

Dam and to ignore the probable depletion of the gas supply before energy from the dam became available.

These inspired doubts as to the economic soundness of the enterprise have now been removed. When Secretary Wilbur called for bids he found himself embarrassed, not by an absence of customers, but by the task of discriminating among applicants for more than two and one-half times the total amount of power to be available. While his final allocation has failed to satisfy all interested parties, it has given complete assurance of the financial practicability of the project and has shed light on a most hopeful development in public control of the power industry.

The Boulder Canyon Dam bill authorized the Secretary of the Interior to resolve conflicts among the applicants for power by making allotments "with due regard for the public interest." The leaders in the fight for government development of the Tennessee, the St. Lawrence and the Colorado have contended that the public interest will not be served until the benefits of cheap government-generated power are fully assured to the ultimate consumer. They have recognized the futility of these great projects as public measuring sticks and automatic regulators of the power industry if the power is merely turned over to private companies for distribution. In California, public agencies were ready and waiting for the opportunity to perform this function.

That applications for more than the total amount of power to be available came from Southern California municipalities or municipal districts was the most significant element in the proceedings. The logic and the justice of this unusual situation called for the allotment of all the power to these public agencies after the prior rights of the states had been cared for. It offered to Secretary Wilbur a sure and simple means of disposing of the power "with due regard for the public interest," and to the consumers who, under any arrangement, must pay for the dam through rates, the assurance that no private power company would profit from a public project at their expense.

But a rival guardian of the public interest appeared on the scene. During the long years when the Boulder Dam bill was being debated in Congress, the Southern California Edison Company labored heroically to prevent its adoption. It and its associates endeavored to show that the chosen site was not a proper place for a dam: they did what they could to belittle the recommendations of the Reclamation Service, they sent their engineers to Washington to testify that Los Angeles had no need for water from the Colorado, they fought the granting of preferential treatment to municipalities in the use of power from the proposed dam. But when the bill became a law, the Edison Company appeared in the novel role of rightful representative of the public interest in Southern California.

It is somewhat difficult to recognize in the opponents of the Boulder Dam bill of a year and a half ago the defenders of the interests of the people of Southern California at the present time. But their claims met with partial acceptance. The tentative division of the power by Secretary Wilbur, after awarding to the Metropolitan Water District for pumping water from the Colorado an amount doubtful as to its adequacy, gave the Edison Company and the city of Los Angeles equal amounts, and reserved for the smaller cities only 4 percent of the total power available. It was entirely inadequate to meet the rapidly growing needs of the municipal light and power system of Los Angeles, and limited the other municipal applicants to but slightly more than one-third of the amount of their applications.

The cities, confident that they would be permitted to buy such power as was not set aside for pumping water and for the states of Arizona and Nevada, were bewildered and disturbed at this development. If the proposed allotment should stand, they were confronted with the necessity of buying back the power from the Edison Company and of paying the company's profits on it as well as the cost of building the dam.

The Edison Company, on the other hand, attempted to obscure the issue in its protest at even this inadequate award to the cities, by its declaration to Secretary Wilbur that "Certainly you have no desire to use a great federal project financed by public funds in such a manner as to stimulate the growth of the public-ownership movement in Southern California."

With the people of these Southern California cities, however, it is not a matter of doctrine or of theory, but of the enjoyment of the full benefits from a public project financed by them, without the payment of tribute to interests which have sought to thwart the progress of the project at every stage. City officials hastened to Washington to make vigorous protest against the distortion of the policy so clearly expressed in the Boulder Dam and Federal Water Power acts of giving preference to municipalities, and in Congress the proposed division of power was denounced as executive nullification of a clearly defined principle laid down by law.

So widespread was the dissatisfaction with the proposed allocation that a compromise was finally effected in March, whereby public agencies were granted a slightly larger share of the power. Under the final agreement, Arizona and Nevada are each awarded 18 percent of the primary power; 36 percent goes to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for pumping water from the Colorado; 19 percent goes to Southern California municipalities, and 9 percent to the Southern California Edison and associated companies. The immediate signing of the contracts made definite action on the great project possible. Congress, shortly before its adjournment, appropriated $10,600,000

for initiating the undertaking, and the actual work has already begun.

There could have been but one valid argument against permitting municipalities to distribute the power—the inability of these cities to manage efficiently the distribution of electricity to their citizens. The facts provided no grounds for this conclusion.

The widely proclaimed decline in municipal ownership has not materialized in California. In the last twenty years only three towns, two of them with less than 500 inhabitants, have sold their lighting plants. In this same period thirteen communities, including Los Angeles and San Francisco, have entered the light and power business. At the present time approximately 40 percent of the population of Southern California is served with electricity by municipal systems. This number would be larger were it not for the almost insurmountable difficulties in purchasing the systems of private companies at fair and reasonable prices and in securing the necessary two-thirds vote of electorates for the issuance of bonds. Customer-ownership campaigns and misleading propaganda have gone far in giving to the power companies the one-third minority they need for the veto of such municipal projects.

The reason for the stability of municipal ownership in California is to be found in its continued success in providing efficient service at low rates and in returning large profits to city governments. Los Angeles generates in its own hydro-electric plants 40 percent of the power it distributes, at less than one-half the cost per kilowatt hour of the energy it purchases. Pasadena, with an efficient steam plant of ample capacity for the needs of the city, is in a strategic position to bargain for the companies' surplus power. Its total production cost is only four mills a kilowatt hour. Both of these cities supply the 40 kilowatt hours per month which the average residential consumer needs for lighting his house at the average rate of 4.5 cents. For an additional electric refrigerator or range, he pays 2.5 cents a kilowatt hour or less.

The smaller cities have long since abandoned their generating plants in favor of the wholesale purchase of energy from the power companies for retail distribution over their own lines. The economies effected by large-scale operations have been largely in the generation of electricity. The economic advantage of large generating plants over small generating plants does not maintain in the case of distribution. A small distributing system can be operated at a cost that compares favorably with that of a large one.

Small municipal distribution systems have several distinct advantages over private distributing agencies. They are not required to earn dividends on plant valuations inflated by outrageous doctrines of reproduction cost, goodwill and going concern; they follow the sound financial policy of amortizing their bonds; and they are able to curtail administrative expenses by utilizing existing municipal facilities, by consolidating light and water systems under one management, and by eliminating high-salaried officers.

That this is more than mere theory is borne out by the operations of a representative group of sixteen municipal distribution systems in California cities ranging in population from 500 to 80,000. These cities follow the general policy of requiring their plants to furnish a large portion of the municipal revenues in addition to maintaining themselves. To do this they buy power at the average price of one cent a kilowatt hour and sell it at rates comparable to, or slightly lower than, those charged by the companies, the maximum rates ranging from four to seven cents.

The results are somewhat enlightening on the subject of municipal light and power. The sixteen plants have reduced their indebtedness, from earnings, until the total amount of bonds outstanding is only 15 percent of the present value of the properties. Since 1920 they have financed all additions and improvements from earnings without the necessity for a single issue of bonds. The average net earnings on their investment for the fiscal year 1927-28 was 30.4 percent. These net profits constituted 27 percent of the total revenues of the sixteen cities for that year.

This accomplishment, it is interesting to note, has been in the distribution of electricity, and in areas which are predominantly residential in character. It is the high cost of distribution for this class of service, the power companies have been careful to explain, although they have produced no adequate figures in justification of their claims, which accounts for the abnormal spread between the charge to the domestic consumer for light and the charge for industrial power. The results obtained by this same group of municipal systems throw some light on this subject. For these plants the average cost of distribution for their predominantly residential service, including operating, maintenance, administrative and commercial expense, is 5.1 mills a kilowatt hour. In no instance, even in the most sparsely settled communities, does it exceed 9 mills. So the utility companies will have to look further for a justification of high rates to small consumers.

The movement for the public ownership of light and power in California is extending to rural as well as to urban communities. Incorporated irrigation districts are beginning to generate and distribute electrical energy as an adjunct to their water development. The two districts of Modesto and Turlock, each including an incorporated city, several small towns and a large acreage of agricultural territory, have had power systems in operation since 1923. Electrical service at low rates has been made available to every farm in the districts without the placing of any construction charges against the owner. Urban and rural residential consumers alike can now purchase the 250 kilowatt hours a month necessary for lighting and for the

operation of a refrigerator and a range at the average rate of 2.6 cents per kilowatt hour.

This group of California cities have amply demonstrated their ability to solve for themselves the problem of the unnecessarily high cost of domestic electric lighting. Their partial victory in the allocation of Boulder Dam power points the way to even greater success in the future and suggests hopeful possibilities in other sections of the United States.

The increasingly apparent weaknesses of our present system of utility regulation reveal the need for some additional leverage upon the private power companies, unless complete public ownership is to be the unavoidable alternative. No more hopeful method can be found than the development under public auspices of such strategically located water powers as those of Muscle Shoals, the St. Lawrence, the Columbia and the Colorado, with preferential rights and full legal authority for those communities which are willing to undertake the function of distribution. In this way not only will Los Angeles be able to continue the influencing of low rates in California, and Seattle and Tacoma in the Northwest, but we shall have established public standards which will go far in the automatic regulation of the power industry. F. L. BIRD.

Beautiful Old Things

A SCENE from an unproduced comedy entitled "Osbert's Career, or The Poet's Progress" (Act 1, Scene 2). Osbert Rosemary, a young poet, has just left home to go to work. On the eve of his departure, the following conversation with his mother has taken place:

Mrs. Rosemary: My dear, when you begin to work, you'll have to learn to be more punctual. I really don't know how you're going to get on. But I couldn't think of anything better for you to do. You're not active enough for the Army, and you haven't enough money for politics. You're not interested in Medicine or Law. And the Church has gone completely bankrupt.

Osbert: Yes, Mother dear: I know.

Mrs. Rosemary: The only thing you can do is write poetry, and poetry is not a profession. So, as the Megrims seemed to think that they might be able to make a place for you designing paperweights in their paperweight factory, I thought that that would be more suitable than anything else.

Osbert: Yes, Mother: I've come to believe that the only hope for modern civilization is simply in making beautiful things. I feel that a real poet making paperweights might change the whole face of the world. Why shouldn't the Megrims revive the glories of the great age of handicraft?

Mrs. Rosemary: Well, my dear, you must be content at first to learn your trade very patiently and humbly. (*She sits down on the sofa, and Osbert sits down beside her.*) Though you won't have to do any real drudgery: the Megrims' business isn't like a modern factory. The Megrims really aren't business people at all—they are very old friends of ours. They were formerly attached to the Court.

Osbert: Yes, of course, Mother dear: I know.

Mrs. Rosemary: With the exception of ourselves, in fact, the Megrims are almost the only family left who still live in their original stone houses. They and we and a very few others. That is a very great distinction and one that you should be very proud of. When you get to Mr. Rudolf's Town tomorrow, you will find all the houses made of glass—and the people who live in glass houses aren't the same as the old race.

Osbert: Yes, Mother dear—of course. I know what it means to be a stone-house man.

Mrs. Rosemary: But you have never seen the glass-house civilization. In the places where everything is made of glass, the roofs of people's houses are always cracking and their floors giving way under their feet. They never feel themselves really safe, so they can never accomplish anything really sound. Why, if they even try to stain their own glass, their houses are taken away by Mr. Rudolf and melted up in the common foundry!

Osbert: Yes, Mother: I think it's disgusting.

Mrs. Rosemary: So you must remember always, my dear, no matter how far away from home you may be, that your standards are stone-house standards—that you do not belong to the world that is made of glass. You must remember that there are certain things which a stone-house man must do, no matter whether the glass-house people do them or not, and that there are things which you mustn't do, even though everybody else does them. The principles of the glass-house people are always being shattered to pieces like glass or being melted into cheap and easy shapes. But the honor of a stone-house man must stand fast and endure like stone!

Osbert: You know that Dominic the Dolmen is my favorite hero, Mother dear!

Old Mrs. Megrim's drawing-room, all in antiquated browns and yellows. Two doors, at right and left (from the actors' point of view), the former leading into the house and the latter to the street door. At the back, a fireplace with a mantel, and on the mantel, a most elaborate clock encrusted with a bristling bronze "allegory" of mythological figures with helmets and spears; above the clock, a family portrait of some semi-royal personage in an

elaborate military uniform and wig. On either side of the fireplace, in which a fire is burning, framed water-color designs for paperweights—they are all in the form of glass globes with little figures inside. On the right and further forward than the door, a glass cabinet for old china and precious old paperweights. Three old-fashioned chairs and a sofa, making a semicircle which faces the audience and of which the right-hand arm is the sofa. In the chair at the extreme left, old Mrs. Megrim is sitting: she is very shrunken and bent and dressed in dull brown: she wears a large lace-bordered bonnet with a visor which completely hides her face. Her son Harry, a blurred and gray-faced man of indeterminable age, with eye-glasses askew on his nose and a light brown suit which needs pressing, is introducing Osbert to his mother. They talk loudly to old Mrs. Megrim, because she is deaf.

Old Mrs. Megrim (*very senile, but with a certain social vigor*): Well, Osbert Rosemary—a man! When I last saw you, you were a tiny little boy. To think that Marguerite Rosemary should have a grown-up son! I always remember your mother, Osbert, as she was when I first knew her. She was the prettiest girl I think I ever saw. The year that she came out, she was the belle of the season. I remember her so vividly at the antelope races! They used to say that there were more people looking at Marguerite Rosemary than watching the antelopes! And then her marriage was so romantic! When she ran away with your father, she left all her suitors gasping: they hadn't counted on being jilted for a man who came from the forests and whom nobody knew. So spirited and charming your father was!—I wish I could see whether you resemble him, but my poor old eyes are so weak that I hardly know nowadays what my own son Harry looks like! (*Harry Megrim laughs foolishly and self-consciously.*) I have to be content to know people through the eyes of the spirit merely—and that is perhaps as good a way as any with those who are near and dear to us. (*She very slowly and feebly opens a bag that draws with a cord at the neck, and takes out a mothball, which she puts into her mouth.*) I won't offer you a mothball, Osbert: they are only for old folks like me: I know that a young fellow like you would scarcely consider them a delicacy!

Harry Megrim (*motioning Osbert toward the sofa*): Do—please sit down, won't you? (*He speaks stutteringly and blurtingly.*)

Osbert: Thank you.

He sits down, but the seat of the sofa collapses, subsiding to the level of the floor.

Harry Megrim: Oh, I'm afraid that you're not comfortable there!—Our furniture is so inefficient—I mean to say, old-ficient—I mean to say, old-fashioned!

Osbert: Oh, no: I'm quite comfortable, thank you!

Old Mrs. Megrim (*who cannot see what has happened*): That sofa belonged to my great-uncle Jerolemon—your great-great uncle, Harry.

Harry Megrim: Are you sure you're quite comfortable there?

Osbert: Yes, thank you: perfectly comfortable!

Old Mrs. Megrim: We have invited Mr. Trixie and Mr. Tiralira to come in this afternoon. We thought that it would be nice for you to meet them. They are very old friends of ours and very dear friends. Mr. Trixie is such a gifted man—so sensitive and so fervent—and Mr. Tiralira is a connoisseur of such distinguished taste!

Harry Megrim: And such a delightful fellow!

Old Mrs. Megrim: And such a charming gentleman! Mr. Trixie and Mr. Tiralira have been kind enough—I should even perhaps say, they have been *heroic* enough—to devote their energies and their abilities—which, in these days of great industries and great fortunes, could be so much more profitably employed elsewhere—to what I may call the esthetic department of our own humble little business—I hardly dare call it an industry! We have felt that new blood was needed—I am sadly behind the times—but Harry follows the modern fashions, and he felt that the time had arrived when new designs for paperweights were imperative, if we were to keep up with the modern taste. So Mr. Trixie and Mr. Tiralira have done us the honor of bringing to our problems their experience and their mature wisdom, and now it is particularly pleasant to know that we shall also be able to profit by the creative spirit of youth. We expect from you, Osbert, new designs even more astonishing and alluring than any which have yet been evolved—with the paperweights, in short, of a poet! I am sorry that *I* shall not be able to see them, but perhaps, after all, that is just as well, for I am sure that, much as I should admire them, I should not understand them at all! (*She laughs and takes another mothball.*)

Harry Megrim (*indicating the drawings on either side of the fireplace*): Those are both designs by Mr. Trixie. That—that one's the Little Torpedo—and that—that's the Iron Pansy—the Iron Pansy, you know is Mr. Rudolf's symbol—and that—that one's the Rudolf monument. Quite up to the moment, you see!

Old Mrs. Megrim: I shall never get used to it! Our paperweights used all to be flowers or ferns or mythological figures!

Harry has opened the cabinet and taken out a large antique paperweight in the shape of a glass ball. He shows it to Osbert and then shakes it: the liquid inside clouds up with little flakes.

Harry Megrim: This is the Edelweiss in a snowstorm.

Osbert (*getting up to look at it*): How lovely!

Harry Megrim (*bringing out another*): This—this is Danaë and the golden shower. It's really an awfully fine one.

Old Mrs. Megrim: Yes: the Danaë! Mr. Tiralira says that he considers it the most perfect paperweight ever made.

Osbert: Oh, what a beautiful one! Let me see! —How fresh and bright the gold still is!

Harry Megrim (*as the doorbell rings*): I think that must be Mr. Trixie and Mr. Tiralira. (*He goes out at the left.*)

Old Mrs. Megrim: I have always thought it would have been in better taste for Mr. Rudolf to have left it to posterity to erect a monument in his honor. But he wanted to be sure it did him justice, I suppose!

Harry comes back with Mr. Trixie and Mr. Tiralira. Mr. Trixie wears a loose yellow tie, a Van Dyck beard, a green velvet jacket and yellow trousers. Mr. Tiralira, who is taller and slender, wears a light pea-green suit, with lavender spats and a pink handkerchief sticking out of his pocket.

Mr. Tiralira (*effusively and gaily, advancing toward Mrs. Megrim*): And how is the loveliest woman in the world? the wittiest, the wisest, the most gracious! The sovereign of all our hearts! The eternal toast of the season! (*He shakes hands with her so vigorously that her wrist breaks and her hand comes off in his.*) Oh, how dreadful! I'm so dreadfully sorry!

Harry Megrim (*taking the hand from him*): It doesn't matter. Mother's getting so dilapidated—I mean to say, debilitated! (*He carefully puts the hand away in the china cabinet and replaces the paperweights.*)

Old Mrs. Megrim: It will be quite easy to have it mended. I fear that I'm becoming a little brittle —like old porcelain, you know! (*She laughs coquettishly.*)

Mr. Tiralira (*bowing*): And even more precious!

Old Mrs. Megrim: I shouldn't bring a very high price today, I'm afraid: after all, I'm not made of *glass!*—and now I must present Mr. Osbert Rosemary—the young man of whom I was telling you—the son of very dear old friends of ours. This is Mr. Trixie, Osbert—and Mr. Tiralira. (*The visitors and Osbert shake hands.*) You must forgive me—I am so blind that I can't see where you are!

Mr. Trixie: What an enchanting old house, Mrs. Megrim! What fascinating old things! It's enough to make one weep to see them—to think that the art of making lovely things should have perished from the earth!

Old Mrs. Megrim: The furniture in this room was given to my great-grandfather by Prince Louis. It was made for him by the royal cabinet-maker.

Mr. Trixie: Ah, say what you like, Mrs. Megrim! there can be no high beauty of living without high distinction of blood! In Prince Louis's days, a lady's drawing-room was as truly a work of art as a miniature or a fugue. Today the glass manufacturers and their government have vulgarized the whole country. Why, I wouldn't give a single chair in this room for the glass government and all its works! (*Osbert has resumed his seat on the sunken sofa; Mr. Tiralira is posted by the arm of Mrs. Megrim's chair; Harry has sat down in the chair nearest the sofa. Now Mr. Trixie seats himself between Harry and Mrs. Megrim, voluptuously stroking the arms of the chair.*) See: the lines of this lovely thing are like a strain of violin music!

As he settles himself, the back breaks and he falls over backwards onto the floor. Mr. Tiralira and Harry spring forward to help him up.

Old Mrs. Megrim (*who is unaware of the catastrophe, taking a mothball with her remaining left hand*): I won't offer you a mothball, Mr. Trixie: they are only for old people like me!

Harry Megrim: Oh, dear! I hope you didn't get broken! I mean I hope you didn't get hurt!

Mr. Trixie (*now on his feet and rubbing the back of his head*): Oh, no! I'm not hurt! Not at all! But I'm perfectly sick about the chair!

Harry Megrim (*flustered and apprehensive*): About the what? Where is it you feel badly?

Mr. Trixie: I mean, I'm broken-hearted about the chair!

Mr. Tiralira: What a pity that these exquisite old things should be subjected to every-day use! They should really be preserved in a museum. I was speaking of it to Mr. Rudolf only the other day. Mr. Rudolf, my dear Mrs. Megrim, is a man of very fine taste. We are in the habit of judging him unfairly—of assuming that he is ignorant and vulgar. But though he rose from such humble beginnings, he has a highly developed sense of beauty. He is a collector—he is in fact our first authority on German imperial mustache cups and old American cigar-bands; and he has what is probably the most complete collection in the world of stickpins made of stuffed and mounted goldfish. One might wish him to collect other things perhaps! but it at least shows an original taste for the curious and the exotic. I was telling him only the other day about your beautiful house, and he said at once that he would like to preserve it—to have it set up just as it was in his museum. He asked whether you would care to sell it, and even named a very generous figure—if any price can be put upon the inestimable!

While he has been talking, Mr. Tiralira has been leaning on the end of the mantelpiece, which is loose and has tipped up at an angle, so that the clock has been sliding down in his direction. Harry Megrim has been watching it anxiously.

Harry Megrim: Look out for that allegory! It's a horrid thing to be spiked by!

Mr. Tiralira (*taking his arm off, as Harry replaces the clock*): Now in the museum they would have that fastened down; they would make it impossible for such a thing to happen. Think if that beautiful old clock had fallen! What an irreparable loss!

Mr. Trixie: Can you really believe for a moment it would be safe to entrust these precious objects to those vandals?

Mr. Tiralira: I believe, as I have just been say-

ing, that you quite misconceive Mr. Rudolf. In any case, he is sending an Emissary to discuss the matter with Mrs. Megrim. I hope you will receive him, dear lady. I think you will find that Mr. Rudolf is fully sensible of the consideration due you.

Mr. Rudolf's Emissary suddenly enters from the door on the right. He is a spare man dressed in a dark suit, with a sharp nose and small mustache. With a swift glance he picks out Mrs. Megrim and goes straight over to her. He does not remove his high black derby.

The Emissary: Mrs. Westermerger Megrim?

Old Mrs. Megrim: I am Mrs. Megrim.

The Emissary (*producing a paper*): I have here an agreement for transference of property drawn up in the Government offices and signed by Mr. Rudolf. According to this agreement, your house and the contents of the house are to be taken over by Mr. Rudolf's Government for the sum of thirty thousand zukors.

Old Mrs. Megrim: Indeed? That is very generous. But I am afraid it is out of the question.

The Emissary: I must advise you that, should you fail to accept these terms, the house and its contents will be confiscated on an order of the Ministry of Monuments.

Old Mrs. Megrim: What is it he says, Harry?

Mr. Tiralira (*intervening*): Only think what it would mean to you, dear lady! Thirty thousand zukors! You would be free to travel and to live as you pleased! You could go to the Spa for the baths—you could resume your old social sovereignty!

Harry Megrim: It—it sounds like a square meal—I mean to say, a square deal!

The Emissary: It has been brought to Mr. Rudolf's attention that H. B. Megrim and Son have been operating a small glass plant independent of the Government Glass Works. This plant has been used for the manufacture of paperweights of a kind not approved by the Government and no longer in demand. I must advise you that all materials and tools employed in unauthorized glass-manufacture are to be surrendered to the Central Glass Works within ten days after the order has been issued. In compensation for these materials and tools, which are obsolete and of little value, you will receive an additional five thousand zukors.

Mr. Tiralira: But consider, dear old boy! Thirty-five thousand zukors! Why, you could begin breeding owls again! It would give you a new lease on life! You know that you would rather breed owls than do anything else in the world! Don't deny it, old boy! It's your vocation and your gift! And Mr. Rudolf has told me confidentially that he will offer you a post in his aviary.

Old Mrs. Megrim: It is kind of Mr. Rudolf, Harry, to wish to make it possible for you to breed owls again!

Mr. Trixie: But what about us, Archy? We can't work for the Central Glass Works!

Mr. Tiralira: But why can't we, my dear boy? Mr. Rudolf will offer us places. He is most eager to have you take over the portfolio of Men's Fashions.

Mr. Trixie: Oh, dear: I'm so easily influenced! I'm afraid I shall allow myself to be persuaded! And what sort of a job will *you* get?

Mr. Tiralira: Mr. Rudolf has been flattering enough to offer me the curatorship of his museum. And you, my dear boy (*turning to Osbert*): you love literature—you are a poet. You will operate the electric ladders in Mr. Rudolf's library. You will love it! You will be mad about it! Mr. Rudolf is a book collector, and his library contains nothing but first editions. You will get a thousand zukors a year.

Osbert (*spiritedly and proudly*): I will never work in Mr. Rudolf's library! I will never work for Mr. Rudolf at all! My people are stone-house people, and my standards are stone-house standards! What do I care about Mr. Rudolf's money and his library and his museum? The work I do, I do for its own sake—the things I make, I make for their own sake! Not to live in a ridiculous palace and to buy things that I can't create. And the things that I make will be alive—not first editions in a library. They will be forces that you can't control.

The Emissary blows a police whistle and two uniformed guards march in from the left-hand door. The Emissary indicates Osbert with a single sharp gesture of the thumb; and the guards snap handcuffs on him.

The Emissary: You will proceed at once to the Great Desert, where you will be instructed in the duties of a sand shoveler.

Mr. Tiralira (*shaking one of Osbert's manacled hands and clapping him on the shoulder*): Go in and win, old boy! It is an arduous exacting life; but there are big rewards for a lad of pluck!

Osbert (*scornfully*): Rewards! What do I care for your rewards?

One of the guards claps a hand over his mouth and seizes him under the arms, and the other takes him by the feet: they carry him out.

Old Mrs. Megrim: That was bravely spoken, Osbert! How I wish I could see you standing there, in all the pride and candor of youth, defying the forces which have undone us! We cannot have you to work with us now—I am sorry, but I know that it will be no hardship not to have to waste the years of your young-manhood in our poky old-fashioned business. I am old and I must surrender. But you have youth and courage and strength. Go forth like a clear-eyed knight, Osbert! Fight the fight of a stone-house man—and maintain stone-house honor uncracked!

The Emissary (*to Mr. Tiralira*): Make them sign: I must go. (*He hands the agreement to Harry.*)

Harry Megrim (*looking at the paper bewilderedly*): But I don't understand it very well! Sup-

pose we should sign everything away and then find ourselves prostitute—I mean, destitute!

The Emissary: Where is the ink?

Mr. Tiralira: In the library (*to Harry*): Come, old boy!

Mr. Tiralira and the Emissary taking Harry by either arm—Mr. Tiralira on Harry's right and the Emissary on the side toward the audience—steer him out through the door at the right.

The Emissary (*to Mr. Tiralira*): Make an inventory at once and mail it to me tonight.

Mr. Tiralira (*clapping the Emissary on the shoulder*): Right you are! Good-night, old boy!

He goes out with Harry. The Emissary, as they leave him at the door, finds that Harry Megrim's arm has come off in his hand. He regards it without emotion.

Old Mrs. Megrim: Yet it was truly kind of Mr. Rudolf to wish me to go to the Spa!

Mr. Trixie: Yes: we shouldn't remember it against him that he was once only a button peddler. His energy and character are magnificent! They have the beauty of some sinewy bronze!

The Emissary goes over to the fireplace and sticks Harry's arm in the grate: he shoves it into the fire with his foot, then quickly goes out to the left.

Old Mrs. Megrim: How brightly the fire burns! I can see it quite plainly now! It reminds me of the autumn days when I first knew your father, Harry—we used to come back from the antelope races and sit around the fire here—we used to talk and drink peach-punch and play games. It brings all our courtship back!

EDMUND WILSON.

Washington Notes

THE FURORE among Kansas politicians over the attitude and actions of the Honorable Alexander Legge, chairman of the Farm Board, and the Honorable Arthur Hyde, Secretary of Agriculture, who recently visited the West with the idea of personally acquainting the farmers with the facts, advising them as to the best means of curing a bad condition and generally surveying the situation, has been noted here by our so-called "party managers" in Washington—and not without alarm. The report is that the wheat farmers are ablaze with indignation over the unprecedented low price of wheat, and resent the refusal of the Farm Board to go into the market again. Senators Allen and Capper petition the harassed Herbert—who certainly has all any ordinary man should have to do in salvaging his Treaty from the snarling senatorial scuttlers—to compel Mr. Legge to buy a hundred million bushels of wheat right off the reel. And the howl that Legge and Hyde should resign is raised on the prairies. The Democrats add fuel to the flames by charging various crimes of omission and commission to the administration, and assail the Farm Board from every angle.

The net result of all this is considerable nervousness among administration leaders and Republicans generally. When the farmers get on the war path, something like consternation always spreads in the Republican camp, though exactly why, it is difficult to understand. Past experience, it seems to me, very definitely proves that while the farmer's normal state of mind is one of unrest and anger toward the party in power, this condition is not translated into votes against the Republican party at the polls. No better evidence of this can be given than was offered in the Coolidge-Davis-La Follette campaign of 1924 and the Hoover-Smith campaign of 1928. During both of these fights the farmers were in a state of turmoil and fury right up to election day. In the 1928 fight the signs of revolt were so many and so concrete that the Democratic management spent nearly a million dollars in financing the professional farm leaders who had flopped to the Smith side. But the revolt did not materialize. It never does. The Republicanism of the Kansas, Nebraska and Iowa farmer is much too ingrained to be uprooted. Nevertheless, when he howls and threatens during a between-campaign period, fear seizes the Republicans and hope fills Democratic breasts.

If you were to judge from the clatter that now comes out of Kansas and the worry in Washington over the attacks on the Farm Board, it would be natural to think that a violent upset in the state would occur at the coming election. Nothing of the kind is to be anticipated. On the contrary, those who know Kansas best are completely confident that every Republican district will be held and that both Republican Senators will be elected. The only doubt is whether Henry Allen, who at this time has three primary opponents for the senatorial nomination, will win. It may be that the opposition to him on various personal grounds, plus the closeness with which he is identified with Mr. Hoover and the administration's policies, may lose him the nomination, though it is not held to be likely. The point is that, whether he or someone else is nominated, the Republican candidate will be elected and the Democrats will have no show at all. Actually, no unbiased observer has any doubt of Republican victory on the senatorial side, and very little doubt of it in the House districts. Considering these facts, it is a little hard to understand the excitement in national political circles, except on the theory that national political circles are easily excited and not very well balanced. Long, long ago I ceased to think that resentment among the farmers, as reflected by their political and professional paid spokesmen in these heavily Republican states, had any real political significance. I write at length about the Kansas situation because, next to the Treaty fight, it has been given more attention in Washington, and has been more talked of, than anything else since the special Senate session began.

It may be of interest to report also on certain phases of New York politics as reflected here. With that astute but not notably conciliatory leader, the Honorable Ogden L. Mills, in Europe acquiring, among other things, first-hand information as to the effect of the new tariff on our foreign trade, the duty of informing the White House political professors of the true state of affairs has devolved on others. Some of these have been down here very recently. The gist of their tale, as it percolates to me, is that the chances of a Republican Governor's being elected

in New York state this fall are distressingly remote. The chief reason, of course, for this predicted Republican failure is the party's internal dissension on the prohibition question. Were it not for this, it is said, they would have no real difficulty, for Governor Roosevelt is immeasurably weaker than his predecessor, the redoubtable Al, and his Tammany support is vastly less sincere. Another reason is the inability to get an outstanding man with a real personal strength to head the Republican ticket. It will be conceded that additional reasons are unnecessary to account for the pessimistic feeling of the so-called "Republican managers" in the state. As far as the prohibition problem is concerned, it is my belief that when the Republicans meet in September, a few weeks before the Democratic convention, they will show a decided swing toward the Wets. They will be forced to do so because, if the Wets are ignored, their ever increasing numbers and militancy will make them an even more serious menace to the party than the Drys are now. Further, I am told that as far as the White House is concerned, the nomination of a Wet on a Wet platform will be no more of a bar to Hoover's endorsement than was Dwight Morrow's advocacy of repeal, which did not prevent the presidential blessing from being bestowed upon him.

A great many seem to find it difficult to reconcile Mr. Hoover's willingness to support a Wet with their belief in the sincerity of his Dryness. It is not only difficult; it is impossible. The answer is that Mr. Hoover is not, and never has been, a prohibitionist; he never said he was. He sincerely believes in enforcing the law as it is, and, in accord with his oath, is sincerely trying to do so; but at no time and in no place has he ever indicated his belief in its wisdom or perfection. This does not seem to me to conflict with his "noble in purpose" campaign declaration. Further, he has explicitly stated his belief in the right of everybody to advocate a change. If I am not misinformed, he made his position in this matter clear to his New York visitors a few days ago, and when he did so, the chances that the state convention would adhere to the regulation Republican plank of law enforcement were appreciably diminished. In my judgment, the more these chances diminish, the brighter will become New York Republican prospects, and the easier it will be to place at the head of the ticket the aforesaid outstanding man whose unavailability is now so bitterly deplored. I do not say that, with a Wet platform and a Wet candidate, the Republicans could win. The upstate Dry vote in the party is large, narrow and determined. Nevertheless, the odds would be improved, and with some such man as James W. Wadsworth or Colonel William J. Donovan, a real fight with a real chance of victory might be made. I mention Wadsworth and Donovan because they seem to me to be the only two Republicans in New York who have a genuine personal following and who could, to some extent at least, offset the Dry Republican deflections with Democratic votes. The jealousies among the prima-donna party leaders, however, make the selection of either improbable. If there is a state in which the Republican party has less intelligent and effective direction than in New York, I cannot recall its name. One interesting thing upon which the leaders who came here agree is that, blue as is the outlook on the governorship, there is practically no doubt that the Republicans will hold all twenty of the seats which they now have in the House. This is one of the reasons for belief in the retention of House control by the Republicans after the fall election. It does much to allay the alarm inspired by the infuriated farmers of the West.

Washington. T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

Romer Wilson's Letters

SIR: It is proposed to publish a memoir of the late Romer Wilson and to issue a selection of her letters. I shall be grateful if her correspondents will send me any letters which they may possess. They will be faithfully copied and returned promptly.

EDWARD J. O'BRIEN.

Villa Pauliska, Muralto-Locarno, Switzerland.

What Good Is Capital Punishment?

SIR: In your issue of May 28, Mr. William R. Matthews takes exception to my statement (in your issue of May 7), that Eva Dugan of Arizona was hanged on flimsy evidence. He says that the evidence at the trial "piled high" against her, and that a reading of the testimony would convince anyone of her guilt.

It may have occurred to the reader that if Mr. Matthews had included in his letter a few samples of this all-convincing testimony it might have enabled him to dispense with a good deal of unconvincing personal opinion, and also to dispense with a shameful diatribe against a woman whose lips are sealed. This was not needed if real evidence was so plentiful, and resort to it is confession that evidence was lacking.

The prosecution followed the same tactics at the sanity hearing. According to the local papers the deputy State's Attorney offered virtually no testimony, but made a furious attack on Mrs. Dugan's character. Its purpose, of course, was to prejudice the jury and public. This often succeeds where evidence is weak, if the accused is poor and friendless.

One of the leading lawyers of New York, Mr. Samuel Untermeyer, has called attention to some twenty-six known cases of persons executed or sent to long imprisonment for crimes of which they were afterwards shown to be innocent. It was the belief of Thomas Mott Osborne that many innocent persons are executed. The fault lies, probably, not so much with juries as with those public prosecutors who are more concerned about achieving a record for convictions than in ascertaining the truth, and also with the sensational newspapers that keep the public mind inflamed.

Mr. Matthews tells of the abolition of capital punishment in Arizona and its reënactment (1918) because of "the large number of cruel murders that followed its abolishment." He lets us infer that the restoration of the death penalty has been effective in checking murders in that state. This is important if true.

The homicide rate for Arizona, as given in the recent report of the committee headed by Dr. F. L. Hoffman and Dr. Bernard Glueck, was twelve per 100,000 of population for 1926-1928 (the only years having complete records); while for twenty-six other states with capital punishment and with complete records covering 1919-1928, the rate was 8.3 per 100,000 of population. Compared with this the six states without capital punishment and having complete records for 1919-1928 show an average rate of only 3.6 homicides per 100,000 of population.

My purpose in discussing the Dugan case was to suggest that life imprisonment be substituted for the death penalty in cases where convictions are based on circumstantial evidence, so that mistakes may be corrected through the discovery of later evidence. In view of the figures just quoted, one may well ask: What good does capital punishment ever do?

Denver, Colo. F. S. KINDER.

Forced Labor in the Dutch East Indies

SIR: In The New Republic of May 28 is a paragraph (page 30) on "forced labor" in the Dutch East Indies. The data given therein were received by you from "a native group" of the islands. You are careful to state that "from this distance it is impossible, of course, to verify the details of this protest." If those details refer to 14,000,000 days of forced labor exacted from the male grown-ups of the islands, I figure that each such male had an average of one day's labor "forced" upon him. But what is this "forced" labor? It is the performance of certain work which takes the place of a tax, such labor as I myself used to perform a few years ago in a Western state, for which I was exempted from the payment of a road tax. We males of the Western village would get together in the morning one day a year, don overalls, sling a shovel over the shoulder and proceed to "work" on the public roads, thereby saving our annual road tax. But this "forced" labor by the natives of the Dutch East Indies is gradually disappearing and a tax is being substituted. Within a short time, therefore, the natives will be able to cherish that emblem of Western civilization, a tax receipt, instead of a shovel. Many natives prefer the latter.

You refer to the expropriation of native land. But, do you not know that there is no colony in the entire world where native land ownership is observed as scrupulously as in the Dutch East Indies? Ask the "European" (white) concessionnaires of plantations about their difficulties in securing sufficient property for their houses, sheds, etc. Not a single acre of public (native) land has been or is being expropriated. All the land belongs to the native population. This policy is one of the crowning glories of Dutch East Indian colonization.

As to "forced" or "indentured" labor on the plantations, combined with "penal sanctions," the advantages to the natives of this system far outweigh its disadvantages. It binds the plantation owner as well as the native laborer. It is in the real sense a contract, guaranteeing a sufficient supply of native labor on the plantations as well as prompt payment and humane treatment of the native by the plantation owner.

When, during the month of May, the rubber planters ceased tapping as a means of curtailing production, the "free" laborers were left to shift for themselves, while the "indentured" or "contract" laborers continued to receive their contract wages.

NEIL VAN AKEN,
Executive Secretary, Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in New York, Inc.

New York City.

Casting a Plague on Both Their Houses

SIR: The Humanist upheaval brings to our attention at least the somewhat neglected truth that the professional politician is a most admirable man. He does not fight for his party behind the subterfuge of its ideals. Having discarded, early, all pretense at viewing the reasons for his allegiance, he knows himself to be quite simply a party man whose entire energy, and even occasional thoughts, are bound up, not in ideas, but in its divisions. And being under no delusions as to the motivation of his actions, he has the perspicacity to waste no time in attempting to deceive others. . . .

On the other hand, consider the Humanists and their critics. The case of Mr. Frank Jewett Mather's review of "The Critique of Humanism" [The New Republic, June 25] is excellent for this purpose. There are elaborate gestures at understanding the ideas contained therein, to the extent of admitting, concerning Mr. Allen Tate's essay on "The Fallacy of Humanism" that because of Mather's "hopelessly unmetaphysical temperament . . . I have rarely read a style that, seeming so important, conveyed to me so little meaning." He even finds some reason in the cerebrations of Professor Dewey, which he, however, also finds unfortunately irrelevant. But his disinterestedness is a feeble pose. His party ire is plainly aroused at the apparent desertion to the enemy camp of Mr. Bandler, whom he mournfully observes is "such a natural friend of Humanism." And there is a decided soap-box quality to the remark that More will not "lose any sleep over Bernard Bandler, III's—versatile chap; he also wrote for the Humanist symposium—account of his philosophic isolation." With which prophetic observation, he entirely disregards what is perhaps the most important, and certainly the most touching, paragraph in either the Humanist symposium or "The Critique of Humanism"—the footnote in the latter to Mr. Bandler's article on More:

> The editor of this volume has asked me to write a note to explain my anomalous position of appearing both in "Humanism and America" and "The Critique of Humanism." As I understand it the discussion is about ideas, not words, personalities or parties. . . . There is no need to explain an apparent change which does not exist.

But Mr. Mather is not alone in his metamorphosis to the politician's method. As precendents he has, of course, Messrs. Babbitt and More themselves, whose violent epithets, remarked upon by your correspondent Mr. McKinsey, have been making history for many years. Despite the fact that Mr. Norman Foerster has taken such care to emphasize the fact that the contributors to his symposium in no sense represented a "party," it is difficult to understand the concrete anger of these venerable gentlemen over mere ideas. (Cf. More's recent harange inspired by the Tate vs. Shafer battle for the championship.) And, for sheer shoddiness, there is Mr. Burton Rascoe, whose "forthright bludgeoning," objected to by Mr. Mather, was provoked by nothing less than indignation at the explosive monstrosities of Babbitt and More! Et ad infinitum, I'm afraid. The thing seems certainly contagious—dangerously so.

Yes, the whole business has a decided political flavor. The Humanists, their antis and their critics should remember, however—More and Babbitt excepted—that it takes the politician years to develop his technique, and until they become more skillful the spectators' pleasure in the battle must, unfortunately, be marred by the inevitable blunders of the awkward amateur.

ELENOR KRAUS.

New York City.

The Spirit of Burleson Lives On

SIR: After denying second-class mailing privileges to The Revolutionary Age, the federal Post Office Department has just banned our seventeenth issue entirely from the mails, first-class as well as second.

This is the first time since the War and post-war Red-baiting hysteria that a working-class publication has been refused the second-class mailing privilege. The significance of this step cannot be mistaken. The declaration that The Revolutionary Age is unmailable is merely a part of the rapidly growing capitalist offensive against the working class and against all labor organizations. The campaign of wage cuts and union smashing, the Hoover-Green "no strike" pact, the increasing police brutality, the attacks on the foreign born, the recent decision of the House of Representatives to "investigate" the Communists and the whole revolutionary labor movement, are all parts of this reactionary offensive against the workers and their organizations. The attack on The Revolutionary Age is the forerunner of a vicious attack on the whole militant labor press of this country.

We believe that the refusal of the postal authorities to mail out the issue of May 21 is not entirely unconnected with the exposure in the same issue of the real source of former Commissioner Whalen's salary and the open publication for the first time of the confidential address on "Labor and War" delivered by Matthew Woll, vice-president of the American Federation of Labor to the Army War College, and the announcement of a series of exposures of the military measures the United States government is now preparing against the working class.

The Revolutionary Age, through its legal representatives, will take all necessary legal steps to beat back this attack of the federal government. But it is upon the support of the masses of the workers whose interests it is defending, and upon the support of all people who really stand for free press and civil liberty against capitalist reaction, that we are depending for a victorious struggle to smash this vicious attack of the Post Office Department.

JAY LOVESTONE.

New York City.

In Defense of the Puritans

SIR: On page 212 of The New Republic of July 9, Cuthbert Wright follows the familiar indictment of the short-lived Puritan witchcraft mania by saying: the "utterly superstitious persecution [in Europe] which was continued *beyond its allotted span* by our Calvinist friends, the Puritans, in free America. (The italics are mine.) The fact is, (1) the Puritan Salem witchcraft delusion was but part and parcel of coincident and contemporary European beliefs, Catholic especially, and Protestant, of the period. (2) The Salem Puritans got over it in nine months; but Protestant, and above all Catholic, Europe held to the belief and executed hundreds. The Roman Catholic Church, as Mencken has pointed out, still believes in witchcraft as part of Satan's activities, and still has rituals of exorcism, etc. It also, in "free Catholic America," South America and Central America and Mexico, executed witches as late as the nineteenth century, and may be doing so still. The Puritans gave up the delusion; free America was sorry for it; but Europe stuck to it and witchcraft cases have been known all over Latin and Slavic Europe long after the 1700's.

Philadelphia, Pa.

HARVEY M. WATTS.

The Literary Digest Poll

SIR: From the reference in your issue of June 11 to the Literary Digest poll, one might think you inclined to accept the significance of the figures of the count at their face value without any analysis. Since this is not the habit of The New Republic, I am suggesting to you a line of study that will disclose that the full record of the voting in the poll shows that the face values of the count totals cannot be trusted to indicate the Wet or Dry tendencies of the country.

Two assumptions seem to be generally made which must both be accepted to validate the returns from the poll. First, that the ballots were sent to a true sample of public opinion. This is to be accepted. The Digest did the best it could, and its best could hardly be improved by any human agency. The second assumption is that the votes were sent in by a true, selected sample of those to whom the ballots were sent, particularly one not affected by any selection based on the Wet-Dry issue. The Digest, in its May 31 issue, prints a table intended to defend the first assumption, which furnishes the figures which undermine the second.

In one column is printed with the name of each state the percentage of the ballots mailed to it and, in a parallel column, the percentage of counted votes received from it. It will readily be agreed that these two percentages will tend to be equal when the first assumption mentioned above is true. Any variations due to local influences affecting the popularity of the poll, such as the prestige of The Digest or the amount of newspaper publicity would be entirely random in incidence, in regard to the issues, and would not affect the significance of the results in such a large poll. But if there should appear a systematic variation, related to the issue, it would have to be explained and credited with its due weight.

It is immediately apparent, in comparing these two columns, that there is a systematic variation, related to Dryness or Wetness. Light voting means Dryness; heavy voting means Wetness—this is the tendency which shows itself in the returns as a whole and in the individual returns of 70 percent of the states. The fact that in some fourteen states the tendency does not appear is not an argument against the systematic, connected character of this tendency; it only shows that local, unconnected causes are capable of submerging it locally.

If the states and the District of Columbia are divided into two groups, there will be one, roughly called the Dry group, of twenty-three states each showing a plurality for enforcement as against repeal, and twenty-six with more for repeal. The twenty-three Dry states were sent 6,264,584 ballots, and they returned 1,180,662 as votes, or 18.8 percent. The twenty-six Wet states received 13,962,786 ballots, from which they sent in 3,577,631 votes, or 25.6 percent. Here is a clearly systematic variation, an effect implying a cause. Certain Dry influences of great power, including the national organ of the Anti-Saloon League, The American Issue, have from the beginning of the poll urged and advised Drys not to vote; that the best way to beat this "Wet propaganda" was to destroy a ballot, to vote by not voting. This variation we have uncovered is precisely the effect that systematic Dry abstention from voting would have.

It is thus shown that the answer to the supposedly unanswerable question, Did the Drys vote?, is definitely that a lot of them did not. But how many took the advice of, or agreed with, the Dry leaders?

A comparison of the Dry-state rate of voting, 18.8 percent, with the Wet-state rate of 25.6 percent of the number of ballots received, indicates that 6.8 percent of those who received ballots in those states is the measure of this influence. For it appears that if these people had shown the same willingness to vote as was displayed in the average Wet state, there would have been 6.8 percent, or 425,991 more votes polled, and if the suggested cause of this shortage is the true one, they would have been enforcement votes. There would be no modification voters among them, for no one but an extreme Dry would take this advice. These figures indicate that this number of voters was, to use an insurance term, "selected" out by their own choice, leaving the actual voters not a true sample. Adding this number to the Dry count in the Dry-state group, 507,932, means adding 83.6 percent to it. The same influences which would change the Dry vote in the Dry state would reduce the normal Dry vote in the Wet state in the same proportion. When we add this correction to the counted Dry totals we have some radical changes on the face of the returns; but all this change is in the direction of bringing the totals more into line with what thinking men and practical politicians believe is the present state of public opinion.

With this correction, not five states, but twenty are indicated to be bone-Dry, with a clear majority of all votes for enforcement. Thirty-nine states show more votes for enforcement than for repeal, and nine are Wet, with more for repeal than for enforcement.

If anyone would protest that this effect is too big for the apparent cause, it could not be a Wet who in the past has charged the same influences which have been at work here with power, not merely to influence voters, but to affect legislatures and Congress. Even if this particular explanation of the abstention of voters in Dry states is ruled out in part or even wholly, the fact of the systematic variation still remains, the fact that the voters counted are not a true sample, but a selected fraction, weighted with Wetness to a degree that makes it unrepresentative of the group to whom ballots were sent.

South Pasadena, Calif.

C. A. FREDERICK.

[There are three comments to be made on Mr. Frederick's letter:

(1.) It cannot be assumed that influences affecting the number of votes returned, other than Wetness or Dryness of the voter, were random in incidence. The fact that in fourteen states, or about 30 percent of the total, no tendency of light voting to accompany Dryness appears, indicates that some other cause or causes may easily be assigned. We are sceptical of the extent to which advice to Drys not to vote was influential, in view of the amount of contrary advice.

(2.) Those Drys who argue that the Literary Digest vote is not a good sample ought not to object to a better sample, to be obtained by an official referendum. The burden of proof concerning the voters' sentiments would seem to rest on them.

(3.) Aside from the question as to the possibility of repealing the Amendment, and admitting for the sake of argument Mr. Frederick's correction of the Digest figures, what does he think about the wisdom of calling on the federal government to enforce laws affecting personal conduct which are opposed by a substantial minority of the whole population and by a majority in nine or more states?—THE EDITORS.]

Classmates

Roosevelt: The Story of a Friendship, by Owen Wister. New York: The Macmillan Company. 373 pages. $4.

ALTHOUGH Owen Wister escaped by two years being in the same Harvard class as Theodore Roosevelt, his book emphasizes the fact that in the larger field of social relations they were indeed entitled to call each other by the endearing name of classmate. They were members of the American upper class, of the interests, attitudes and values of which the book is an illuminating record. Wister as a freshman fell under the spell of the already distinguished upper classman, who extended to him a kindly patronage, all the way from the Dickey to the White House. Wister was always the artist—composer of topical songs for the Hasty Pudding Show, later of stories of the vanishing Wild West and the Old South, and finally of horrendous screeds against the Germans and Wilson, in all of which Roosevelt delighted. Much of the present book is concerned with this literary career, beginning with excerpts from the college songs, and leading to the crowning phrase, "The foremost American man of letters," bestowed by Roosevelt in recognition of polemical achievement. This preoccupation with the author's own career is natural in view of the sincere interest which Roosevelt took in its three phases. He was himself the butt of Wister's wit at the Pudding in the genial lines:

> Awful tart
> And awful smart,
> With waxed moustache and hair in curls,
> Brand new hat,
> Likewise cravat,
> To call upon the dear little girls;

but when Wister informed him of the fact he took it good-naturedly, and gave utterance to one of those bits of aphoristic admonition with which he was accustomed to guide the steps of the younger and frailer brother: "Never indulge yourself on the sinner's stool. If you did any harm, that won't undo it; you'll merely rake it up. The sinner's stool is often the only available publicity spot for the otherwise wholly obscure egotist."

Later Roosevelt's own experience in the West made him an expert critic of Wister's stories. It is noteworthy that his criticism, astonishingly generous in amount and exact detail, always tended to curb the younger man's esthetic daring, by invoking the principles of reticence and good form. Doubtless "The Virginian" owes something of its continued vitality to this painstaking interest, for Mr. Wister informs us that between May 1, 1928, and May 1, 1929, 33,986 copies of the book were sold. And finally, when the War began, no two men in the United States hated Germany with greater fervor. Both believed at first in neutrality, but Roosevelt quickly forgot that he had opposed intervention on behalf of Belgium, and when Wister's "Pentecost of Calamity" was sent to him for a preliminary reading, he corrected his friend's political astigmatism: "You say that it would have been an act of 'unprecedented folly' if we had not been politically neutral. On the contrary, in my view the really unprecedented folly was in exercising our loose tongues in a way thoroughly to irritate Germany and yet to do nothing whatever to back these aforesaid tongues by governmental action." "Exercising our loose tongues" is, of course, priceless. Wister made some changes in the proof sheets, but evidently did not entirely satisfy his mentor, who admitted only "that from the spiritual side it represents the loftiest expression of the true American feeling that there is."

All this presents Roosevelt in his most attractive light, "familiar, friendly, condescending, free." And he is presented in his most attractive background, the White House, surrounded by a group of loyal friends who constituted the Familiars, as opposed to those who had to be invited for official reasons and were known as Unfamiliars. Roosevelt had a genius for friendship, which Mr. Wister, by participation in many examples of it, is fully entitled to recognize and record. There were the classmates of Harvard days, Bob Bacon, Woodbury Kane, "Winty" Chanler; there were the élite of Washington, Justice Holmes, Ambassador Jusserand, Henry Adams, John Hay, Elihu Root, Henry Cabot Lodge, Leonard Wood. Of these Mr. Wister gives vigorous portraits, perhaps none more striking than that of Gifford Pinchot—which, however, he regretfully turns to the wall. "[His] service to the nation cannot be wholly obliterated by his subsequent career. . . . As I cannot speak well of it, I will not speak of it at all." Of Mr. Justice Holmes the portrait is unusually sympathetic. Mr. Wister evidently fears that the jurist may have suffered some derogation in the minds of classmates from his frequent association in dissenting opinions with Mr. Justice Brandeis, and accordingly he takes pains to analyze their decisions to show the difference between the true New England mind and the Oriental. This is not strictly relevant, and there are some other passages that seem trivial or garrulous, as when Mr. Wister tries to convince a Frenchman that the Black Mass is scurrilous if God exists, and nonsense if He does not. There is much correspondence of a purely mechanical sort which might well have been omitted as serving nothing to the present purpose—for example, Roosevelt's note upholding the Department of Commerce in refusing to admit Princess Kropotkine to this country "because she called herself an anarchist."

Upon domestic politics, consideration of which fills a considerable part of the book, Mr. Wister reflects some uncertainty. He is naturally anxious to exonerate Roosevelt from the charge of being a radical trust-buster, which character was so offensive to classmates, and at the same time, to show his sympathy with labor. Fortunately the record supplies him with material for both purposes. If Roosevelt brought suit to break up the Northern Securities combination, he permitted the fusion of Tennessee Coal and Iron with United States Steel. One balance which Mr. Wister establishes must be the result of misunderstanding. Over against the fact that Roosevelt shook his fist in the face of J. P. Morgan at a Gridiron Club banquet, he declares that he shook the same fist in the face of Samuel Gompers for "attempting to identify our aims and methods with those of Soviet Russia." This seems highly improbable, to say the least.

Mr. Wister's own sympathies remain with his class. He was caught in the Pullman strike of 1894 at Los Angeles, and compelled to finish his journey to San Francisco by boat in much discomfort. Later he was detained in San Francisco because trains had stopped running, the last one from Oakland being interrupted by "a Debs-minded citizen" who "threw his baby, wrapped in the American flag, in the path of the locomotive." When Mr. Wister at length got back to Newport, he was surprised to find his classmates "not in the least eager" to hear of his adventures, but he forgives them. "None of them had been

obliged to get out of their pullman and be packed on the floor of a steamer's cabin for two nights." Even the baby wrapped in the American flag was nothing more than an after-dinner story, forgotten the next day. He had the happiness, however, of finding his idol seeing eye to eye with him more and more in regard to the social struggle. He does not associate Roosevelt with his own view of Tom Mooney, twice stated, as "a bomb thrower and murderer"; but he quotes Roosevelt's letter justifying the deportations of the I. W. W.'s from Bisbee into the desert. "No human being in his senses doubted that the men deported from Bisbee were bent on destruction and murder." Of course they should have no protection at law. The same reasoning justified the attacks on the I. W. W. by business interests at Tulsa, at Centralia, and wherever else the only labor organization which had done anything for the proletarian worker was wiped out in blood. It was a great satisfaction to Mr. Wister to find that Roosevelt's heart was with his classmates after all, and that he needed only the sanction of war to express himself freely.

The same naïveté which permits Mr. Wister to call Tom Mooney guilty because the court had convicted him, and Haywood and Moyer guilty because the court had acquitted them, characterizes his view of the Great War. He was at Triberg when a bulletin "announced the assassination of a couple I had never heard of in a place with a strange name that I could not pronounce." This profession of provincialism sounds like boasting, for surely the name of Franz Ferdinand was known to everyone who was entitled to have an opinion on international affairs. Mr. Wister reached America to learn that war had begun. His book is a mirror of the mind of classmates during the next four years. He makes Count Berchtold the arch-villain, not mentioning the connivance of the Serbian government in the murder of the Archduke. He finds Sir Edward Grey the most noble figure—"unfortunately under the great embarrassment of having carried through the step taken by Edward VII and given France to understand that she could rely upon England." Mr. Wister's view of the English Constitution is equaled only by his opinion of the veracity of Sir Edward Grey. If he and Roosevelt differed for a while as to United States neutrality, they were at one soon after the sinking of the "Lusitania," which, by the way, no one would suspect from Mr. Wister's comment of carrying munitions of war to the Allies. This unanimity was fortunate for their friendship, judging from the contempt which Mr. Wister displays for everyone who disagrees with him. It is a moving picture which we get of the two classmates singing their hymns of hate together—hate of the Kaiser, hate of Wilson, hate of the I. W. W. and all who wanted to keep the War from becoming the grave of American democracy and civil rights—but most of all of Wilson, "the real enemy; the demagogue, adroit, tricky, false. Without one spark of loftiness in him, without a touch of the heroic in his cold, selfish and timid soul." In such invective Roosevelt clearly surpasses even "the foremost American man of letters."

One day during the parleyings over the Armistice when the two classmates were discussing their usual topic, Roosevelt "sprang to his feet like a boy, stood with his arm flung out, and exclaimed: 'Oh—don't—let's—talk about him—any more today—at all.'" And to this sentiment we join our voices to that of Mr. Wister in giving a fervent Amen.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Llewelyn Powys

Apples Be Ripe, by Llewelyn Powys. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

The Cradle of God, by Llewelyn Powys. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 302 pages. $3.

An Hour of Christianity, by Llewelyn Powys. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company. 157 pages. $1.

THE POWYSES are a remarkable family. Of six brothers, three have achieved distinction in literature; two, an architect and the principal of a school, are well known in England; and the sixth has a stock farm in East Africa. Mr. Llewelyn Powys is, I believe, the youngest. All his books hitherto have been parts or episodes of his life, fragments of autobiography. The theme of "Apples Be Ripe," his first novel, is sensitive youth and stolid society, the natural man in the strangling grip of convention. "The Cradle of God" retells from the emancipated standpoint the story of the Old and New Testaments. Mr. Powys says: "It was my original intention to write a book describing my travels in Palestine. I found, however, when I set about the task, that my mind was bent upon meddling with these high matters in a different way. There seemed to be a kind of impertinence in combining the two methods, and so I decided to reserve the narrative of my personal observations to a later date." "An Hour of Christianity" is in a sense a sequel to "The Cradle of God"; and the two present, at length, the conception of things cosmic, social and personal which is implicit in the novel.

Is it essentially the state of mind toward which all those whose temperaments permit of it are drifting? It is not quite that of the Ecclesiast; it admits values in this very fleeting impermanence. It is more like that of Jasper Petulengro in "Lavengro":

> "When a man dies he is cast into the earth, and there's an end of him, brother, more's the pity"—"Why do you say so?"—"Life is sweet, brother. There's day and night, both sweet things, and moon and stars, brother, all sweet things. There is likewise the wind on the heath. Dosta! We will now go to the tents and put on the gloves, and I will make you feel how sweet a thing it is to be alive."

At least the mood of the hour seems to be saying: "Let us have no more formulas or illusions. We only know what we know, and that is not much. We are girded with mystery, but we need not people it with goblins. Sweetest of all mysteries are the burgeoning impulses within us, reaching for the sunlight with their delicate tendrils. Sourest of sins is the hiding, crushing, burying of them under dead formulas and rank prohibitions, to perish and rot and fester." No, Mr. Powys is not quite like either the Ecclesiast or Mr. Petulengro, but he has a touch of their thrilling rhetoric. He is, perhaps, the best of the three Powys writers; only now and then a little self-consciously decorative, a little self-consciously defiant of traditional reserves, like the first Quaker who sewed on hooks and eyes in the feeling that buttons savored, if not of popery, at least of the fashion of this world which passeth away. Fashions in buttons and euphuisms do not greatly matter.

The story of Abraham and his sons and his sons' sons has the matter-of-fact gravity of the Icelandic sagas. In folk tales, told by elders to the younger about their forefathers and the forefathers of people they knew, genealogy and kin connections are important; and so are the names

of familiar places and why they were so named. There is a natural selection going on as generation follows generation, remembering and forgetting—and adding, though in general not consciously—until the thing is a sort of racial secretion, and weather-worn as a tree. But the folk treatment of the old stories, Old Testament or New, did not entirely cease with the establishment of the canon. Legend still floated about and adhered. The Miracle Plays were modernizations according to their time. And are not all these recensions and retellings, even to the latest, "folk work" in some sense or other?

The first modern treatment, so far as the "modern" means the rationalistic treatment, of biblical stories, was by Peter Bayle in his "Dictionnaire Historique et Critique," 1697. The most rationalistic of contemporary commentators is not more so than Voltaire; but he has the advantage of a hundred and fifty years of investigation, of massed and sifted knowledge, such as no other era ever saw. Mr. Powys has read widely. He speaks the twentieth-century mental idiom and speaks it well. But I suspect that a biblical scholar might have some caustic remarks to make. If Mr. Powys understands himself to have written a historical resumé as well as an interpretation, it is not very critical to treat, and to appear to regard, Abraham and Israel in Egypt as historical in the same sense and degree as the Babylonian captivity or the wars of the Maccabees. I do not know what exceptions a scholarly historian might take, on the grounds of evidence, to Mr. Powys' interpretation of the history of Christianity. I should suppose that his distinction between the ethics of the Gospels and Pauline theology is essentially sound, and that neither he nor Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn is the first to moralize on that divergence, or has added very much to the subject. And anyone who can bring to the New Testament a mind swept bare of Sunday schools and theologies might find the following not so far from his own candid opinion:

> No teacher ever laid down a harder and narrower way for his disciples, and none from the first has been less obeyed. . . . The secret of Jesus can never be recaptured. It never has existed in any ultimate rational form. It is intangible as the breath of a child. There is everything in it and nothing in it. If a scribe had been standing by, scroll in hand, to take down the actual words he spoke, still no logical theology could be made out of them. . . . The soul of man was all his care. His hatred of hypocrisy was an obsession with him. . . . A mean soul he could smell from afar off like a bad fish. He definitely preferred a fornicator, an adulterer, a good bad man, to the sanctimonious self-righteous. . . . Jesus hated dead estimates. All those depressing surface standards of the commonplace unillumined world he could not abide. The only kinds of people he execrated were the strict moralists, the petty-minded priests of his day, the sly conventional oppressors.

Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn thinks that the New Testament is unfair to the Pharisees, which is probable. Mr. Powys is perhaps equally unfair to the social and religious tradition, but he is entitled to his precedent. His "Hour with Christianity" is not all along this line, but his novel is; and the quotations serve also to illustrate that he is an admirable writer.

It may be that these books will reach more readers than the sections of autobiography which have hitherto represented him; but I like the latter the better, and shall be more interested in his Palestine experiences than in his handling of these "high matters." And yet these books are not trivial, nor is their point of view unsignificant. Something in the twentieth century is visibly escaping the theological Christ, is trying to get back to the friend of sinners, to "the personality that bewitched men and filled their wits with a new-moon madness," and to find that secret of life which is personal and not institutional or economic. The effort has been made before. As embodied in institutions, it always fails, and the vital thing, which has something in it and nothing in it, gradually or suddenly is gone. But its memory is its prophecy, and though the secret is never captured and cannot be caged, something of it, or something like it, is always being somewhere born again. ARTHUR COLTON.

A Hebrew Scholastic

Crescas' Critique of Aristotle, Problems of Aristotle's Physics in Jewish and Arabic Philosophy, by Harry Austryn Wolfson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 759 pages. $6.

IN THE twelfth century, Maimonides, the greatest of the Jewish scholastics, summed up (in twenty-five propositions) the main principles of Aristotle's philosophy. He gave no proofs. These were supplied two centuries later by a Spanish Jew, Hasdai Crescas, who put them together from material which he gathered from the works of Aristotle and the Aristotelian commentators.

Crescas, however, was not interested in proving the truth of Aristotelianism. He furnished the proofs solely for the sake of demolishing them. He did, for the most part, succeed in this. He was able, through the use of a subtle dialectic and the method of posing logical alternatives to stated views, to undermine and bring into question a great deal of the hallowed Aristotelian structure. But he was either unable or unwilling to develop the points he scored. His positive work, therefore, though it contains some shrewd reasoning and many an interesting anticipation of modern views, is of little value today. It does serve, however, to show that the decline of the authority of Aristotle did not have to wait on a period of quickened interest in science or on a penchant for Platonism or Empiricism.

Using the first edition and eleven manuscripts as his basis, Professor H. A. Wolfson provides the Hebrew text and a readable English translation (to its accuracy I cannot attest) of Crescas' proofs and disproofs of the twenty-five propositions. The propositions by Maimonides and the proofs of them by Crescas offer an able summary of the Aristotelian philosophy, but it is too compact and bristles with too many technical terms to be of value to any but thorough Aristotelians and Medievalists. To the text and translation, accordingly, Professor Wolfson has prefixed a statement of the Aristotelian philosophy as it was interpreted by the leading Arabian commentators and the Jewish philosophers. But what is more important, making use of his knowledge of Aristotelian literature, Hebrew, Arabic, Latin and Greek, he has been able to provide a careful commentary (four times as long as the text itself) in which the highly technical medieval vocabulary and the development of some basic philosophic concepts in the hands of Arabian and Jewish commentators are discussed and clarified. The result is a scholarly work of high attainment, containing much material to be found nowhere else in English. Professor Wolfson not only succeeds in making the Maimonides-Crescas proofs intelligible, but converts his book into a fine reference work on the philosophy of Aristotle, particularly as seen through the eyes of some of his most ardent and competent disciples. PAUL WEISS.

The Russian Theater

The Russian Theater, by René Fülöp-Miller and Joseph Gregor. Translated by Paul England. Philadelphia. J. B. Lippincott Company. 129 pages. $25.

Myself and The Theater, by Theodore Komisarjevsky. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 205 pages. $3.75.

NO MORE attractive evidence of the breadth, variety and dynamic aliveness of the Russian theater is now available in English than the book which Lippincott has recently brought out in a limited edition. There is about this large and heavy volume with its more than four hundred handsome illustrations a kind of children's picture-book gaiety, an exuberance and excitement which not only give pleasure in themselves, but make us reflect on the precise nature of the Russian theatrical genius.

A passionate naïveté is perhaps its fundamental characteristic. The Russian not only delights but fervidly believes in the efficacy of the theatrical mask. The Italian, too, approaches the theater with a kind of simple-hearted acceptance, but he assumes the mask in a spirit of playfulness, a laughing and wise escape to the brighter world of the imagination. The theater to him is a happy and lyrical game, a game which, child-like, he plays for its own sake, with gusto and even with heat, but its effect is to create a reality distinct from the world in which he actually lives. He uses the mask because he loves make-believe. But the Russian uses it because in this way he hopes to come into profounder contact with reality. Indeed his naïveté derives from the conviction that the more he makes believe the more real he will be, and that only through the mask can he fathom the ultimate truths of life. To the Russian, then, the theater is a sort of mystic function which he performs not to bemuse himself, but to become more intensely aware, more truly alive—to grasp, as it were, the very core and crux of things.

In this fundamental attitude all the divergent currents of the Russian theater unite and become one. When we perceive it we begin to understand why, on the one hand, even the traditionally realistic Russian actors have an almost old-fashioned staginess about their make-ups, while, on the other hand, the most "futurist" of Russian performances never betray that emasculate artiness which we associate with the *avant-garde* theater nearer home, but are, on the contrary, always robust, vital, real. Indeed, if the pictures of the "realistic" Moscow Art Theater production of "The Inspector-General" are compared with those of Meyerhold's "stylized" production, the kinship rather than the difference will be more striking to the eye accustomed to the merely literal theaters of Anglo-Saxon countries. In fact, it might quite justifiably be maintained that of the two, the realistic production was the more "theatrical" and Meyerhold's the more serious, the more vehemently mordant.

The Russian theater, in short, even before the Revolution, had become the most inspiring and significant of the twentieth century, because of the very nature of the Russians' approach to their art—in other words, because it is at once vivid with that mask-like quality we know to be the essence of the genuinely theatrical, and closest to the pressing and actual interests of the world which gave it birth.

Now turn from the concrete image of the book's illustrations to the short text that prefaces them, and its inadequacy as critical comment on so rich an achievement becomes painfully obvious. This incongruity is especially worthy of remark since Gregor, the main author, appears to be a man of taste and cultivation, attempting to bring to the theater something more than the poor devices of journalistic opinion-slinging. In fact, though his notes are spotty and hurriedly composed, Gregor says a number of suggestive things on the Russian actor and kindred matters. So carefully, indeed, has he surveyed his material that he is able to discover the influence of the old ikon illuminators on the methods of the post-revolutionary scene designers. But just this is the clue to his shortcomings. The scene designers have not been influenced by the early artists: their work reveals resemblances because deep characteristics inherent in all Russian art may be noted in both. What leads Gregor to make this academic parallel is his failure to see the theater as an independent and single art. Like most of the more estimable critics of the theater, he comes to it through his pursuit of another art, and he seeks in the theater chiefly those qualities and laws that pertain to the art of his original interest.

Thus, there are critics whose interpretation of the theater tends to emphasize the literary, others the plastic, the musical or the terpsichorean. But the theater can never be intelligently appreciated except in its own terms. The theater is not a plastic or a musical or a literary art, or even, as some might lead us to believe, an art that arises from the simple arithmetical addition of these factors. The theater is as "pure" and autochthonous as any of the other arts, elements of which appear in it only as attributes of its own manifestation.

If Komisarjevsky's pointless and fatuous book has any value whatsoever it is in its constant reminder of the actor's crucial position in the theater. The theater cannot be understood as theater unless the genesis of the dramatic instinct is studied both in its individual and in its social sources: the actor, and the group from which the actor emerges. Gregor's methodological notes—like most esthetic comment on the theater in general and on the Russian theater in particular—have no sure relevancy to their subject because they are uncoördinated, dealing separately with costumes, sets, actors, directors—and not with the Theater! Fülöp-Miller, who merely outlines the metamorphoses of Russian life, speaks more pregnantly about the resultant changes in the theater because he, at least, concentrates on a single and vital seed of origin. HAROLD CLURMAN.

Bolivar

Simón Bolívar, South American Liberator, by Hildegarde Angell. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 294 pages. $3.

MISS ANGELL has attempted to cover an extremely difficult subject. Simón Bolívar was not, in any sense of the word, an ordinary man; even for an acutely romantic period he was extraordinarily romantic. He fully absorbed the inebriating and fashionable sentimentality of "La Nouvelle Héloise," having later, in fact, bequeathed to the University of Caracas, as a most treasured possession, his marked copy of Rousseau's "Contrat Social." While in Paris, the Nietzschean part of him was dazzled and seemed definitely molded by the coronation of Napoleon, which he witnessed at Notre Dame, and although, as the descendant of the Basque lords of Aragua, he was born into wealth and power, he forswore the refinements of life in a European court and disinterestedly decided to play the role of liberator of the Spanish colonies. He even dreamed of setting Cuba and the Philippines free. Since, according to one of his enemies, he "was War," almost single-handed,

Bolívar wrested away from Spain the greater portion of its immense empire. Because of anarchy and intrigue, his declining years were filled with misery, and when death overtook him at the age of forty-seven, he kept by his bedside Cervantes' "Don Quixote."

Bolívar, it is apparent, should only be approached directly in the manner of Stendhal and Conrad, or, let us say, explosively by Unamuno. Since to Miss Angell, however, Bolívar is only a plain Wall Street "captain of industry," she is not able to let us see him between the heaven and earth of the inner spiritual conflict which made of his life an heroic tragedy, and of his death, unlike that of Don Quixote, a bitter disillusionment. In spite of the fact that he strikingly possessed the stature, the high purpose and the driving intensity of greatness, Bolívar failed to unify South America. He was suddenly awed and overwhelmed by the magnitude of the chaotic tempest which he willed, and hence he was forced to confess in a lucid moment of meditation that he had "ploughed the sea."

This, then, is unmistakably Bolívar's drama, and in this respect Miss Angell, who seems to be applying, although decorously, the formulas of current biography, has not been particularly successful. It is Bolívar's character which chiefly interests us, but Miss Angell has emphasized inordinately the colonial background against which, incidentally, he moved. Thanks to the ease with which she has mastered her material, Miss Angell has succeeded merely in presenting a circumspect and uneventfully proper, though at the same time sympathetic and straightforward, picture of a highly turbulent man and of his period. Less sanguine than one of the professors whose name appears on the jacket as an endorser, I am still inclined to believe that Bolívar's "definitive" biography in English is yet to be written.

E. MUNGUÍA, JR.

Notes on Novels

Harm's Way, by Roberts Tapley. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

MOST GLARING, in this novel, is the evident lack of self-criticism. Mr. Tapley seems to have been possessed with a vast number of things to say, none of which he was able to isolate or to reject. Some reflection, for instance, might have revealed to him that Babbitt-baiting, since 1920, has been fairly done to death, and that those chapters in which Richard Annesley discovers the American Business Man might well have been pruned, in the interests of originality. Further, he appears to be still experimenting with his style, toying indecisively with such devices as the recurrence of an effective paragraph. The whole seems uncontrolled, loose-strung, tentative, a testing of strength. Yet the book is not to be thus waved away, for the strength is unquestionably present. There are in it pungent observation, a sensitive feeling for meanings and essences and more than a few passages of fine, adult prose. The latter part, dealing with Richard and Eleanor, is especially good, and might easily have been developed, free of encumbrance, into the eloquent novel Mr. Tapley must have had at the back of his mind.

N. L. R.

The Woman with a Thousand Children, by Clara Viebig. Translated from the German by Brian Lunn. New York: D. Appleton and Company. $2.50.

CLARA VIEBIG in all her books draws portraits of either the very simple farmer type or of the lower class of workers in the city. Her sketches, always naturalistic, are much like the drawings of Käthe Kollwitz, who belongs to about the same period. In "The Woman with a Thousand Children" she is concerned with the city dwellers; not so much with the working class itself as with the potentialities of that class as expressed in its children, "Children of the Proletariat whom no protecting hand can guide to school. . . ." To guard these children there are, on the one hand, dissipated, overworked or indifferent parents; and, on the other hand, teachers who, afraid for their positions, are grateful if they can gasp along in the daily routine of life. These conditions are feelingly portrayed with a sense of selection and with vividness of style. Over the whole story hovers the figure of "the woman," a slightly overhealthy heroine who has to cope with the stale problem of the incompatibility of marriage and a career, and who, in a burst of almost unbelievable enthusiasm, decides in favor of the latter. The combination in this one woman of adolescent emotions and adult reliability, of childish ignorance and the wisdom of the ages, is not always entirely convincing.

J. R.

Droll Peter, by Felix Timmermans. Translated by Maida C. Darnton and Wilhelmina J. Paul. New York: Coward-McCann. $2.50.

IF ONLY some day a novelist would write a story about an artist wherein there is no reference to art and the man himself is given as a man! For an artist's work is so much more enthralling than his ideas and emotions *about* his art that all the way through you want to drop the book, and go instead to the picture gallery or the concert hall. And not one novelist in a hundred thousand knows or can show how a painter feels about painting, or how a composer feels on the verge of a tone poem. Even "The Romance of Leonardo" is exciting chiefly as a picture of the Renaissance. You find the usual trouble in "Droll Peter"—a lusty and amusing and often beautiful story of Breughel and sixteenth-century Flanders. Timmermans comes nearer than most to weaving in one pattern a painter's life and a painter's painting; and the novel is especially notable for having the hero consider his art as *art*—and not as politics, morality, sexual love, or (as in "Jean-Christophe") an excuse for something else, like the federation of European states. There are vividness, humor, close-knit adventure, and humanity as broad as a Hals painting. None the less, the novel falls between two easels: art and life. There's the old fallacy (so dear to writers) that an artist goes about being self-conscious of what he's going to paint next; but the canvas is broad and glowing and the figures are in the round.

DONALD DOUGLAS.

Contributors

CHARLES A. BEARD is the author of "American Government and Politics," "The Rise of American Civilization" (with Mary Beard) and other books.

JOHN GALSWORTHY, British novelist and playwright, is probably best known for "The Forsyte Saga."

H. N. BRAILSFORD, the eminent English journalist and specialist in foreign affairs, is the author of "Shelley, Godwin and Their Circle" and other books.

FREDERICK L. BIRD is secretary of the Committee on Coal and Power, and author, with Frances M. Ryan, of "Public Ownership on Trial."

ARTHUR COLTON, novelist and poet, contributes articles on criticism to various magazines.

HAROLD CLURMAN reads plays for the Theater Guild and is a member of the Guild Studio Production Committee.

E. MUNGUÍA, JR., is a young Mexican lawyer and writer who has recently translated into English Azuela's "The Under Dogs."

INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

HITHERWOOD

An International Hostel and Guest House

London

For Students and Holiday Visitors from Overseas.

Terms and particulars from

THE HOLIDAY FELLOWSHIP,
Highfield, Golders Green Road, London, N. W. 11.

SUMMER PLACES

For Relaxation, Beautiful Country, Pleasant Companionship, Tennis. Adults. Rates, $25.00 a Week.

Phone to

The Hil-BERT HOUSE
Lake Mahopac, New York
HIL FRIEDBERG, Prop. Tel. Mahopac 353.

Aberdeen Inn. West Park-on-Hudson. Overnight or permanent guests. Colonial house, thirty-six acres river front. Lawns, woods, beach. Center Catskill and Berkshire motoring. Accessible West Shore, N. Y. Central, via Poughkeepsie. Day line. For people who want quiet vacation in beautiful place. Rates moderate. Write **Manager, Aberdeen, West Park, New York.**

Quiet, charming vacation place for limited number of grown ups with artistic and literary interests. Modest rates. Ask for circular.

CAMP ARTEMIS
BREWSTER NEW YORK

SPEND delightful summer in Virginia. Off tourist route. Large colonial estate in Shenandoah Valley. Privacy. Best of Southern cooking. Seven hours to City. Free golf, $10 to $16 weekly. Major Marshall MacDonald, Media Farm, CHARLES TOWN, W. Va.

FOR A RESTFUL WEEK END or vacation in the beautiful Watchung Hills, fine views, bracing air, homelike atmosphere, finest foods. Individual diet if desired. 45 minutes from N. Y., C. R. R. of N. J Mrs. Zerkover, R. F. D. 3, Plainfield, N. J. Phone Plainfield 6-5310 J-2.

NEW HOPE, Pennsylvania, rooms and meals, available from July 1st, in small seventeenth century stone house beautifully restored, near Delaware river, two miles north of New Hope. Write: Louise Holmquist.

For your vacation, furnished cottage, exclusive neighborhood, delightfully located. Swimming and tennis. $60 for two weeks, or $100 per month. Sign up now by writing Rose Angell, 113 Graham St., New Brunswick, N. J.

Country board in Maine. Women only. Lake, pine woods, cabins, all sports. $25 weekly. Address: Box 505, The New Republic.

HOME FOR CHILD

Free home offered to child 2 to 5 of good parentage. Christian. R. F. D. Box 96, Sharon, Mass.

PARTNER WANTED

MIDDLE AGED SINGLE MAN wants agreeable partner with $5,000—secured by mortgage on New Jersey poultry plant in town of 10,000 population. No poultry work required. Living Supplied. Address: Box 497, The New Republic.

BOOK STORE FOR SALE

An established book shop in San Francisco that averages about $10 a day net profit is offered for sale for $2,500 cash or will accept $1,500 cash and take mortgage on stock worth $5,000. Low rent. Living quarters. Ideal investment for a couple in a congenial business. Address Box 507, The New Republic.

FARMS FOR SALE

Several farms, good size, stone houses and barns, hill country, near Delaware, 75 miles from New York, 40 from Philadelphia, low prices ($3,000 to $6,000). Address John Coffey, Erwinna, Pa.

FOR SALE

HOUSE IN CHELSEA

$3,000 buys house facing park in old Chelsea. 4 stories, 12 rooms, 3 baths, steam heat, fireplaces, garden. Quick sale imperative. Price, $32,000. Bailey, 109 Seventh Avenue, South, New York City.

POSITIONS WANTED

Young Jewish Girl, university graduate, amiable personality, sincere in her work, desires a position next September in a public or private secondary school or as private tutor, in piano, music appreciation, English, Latin or German. Best references as to character and education furnished upon request. Address Box 508, The New Republic.

YOUNG MAN, exceptional personality, liberal education, whose eyes have recently failed, would like to take charge of a group of exceptional youths next winter. Creative methods in general. Conversational French. Address, Box 496, The New Republic.

Young professional man, twenty-five. College graduate, good physique, wishes to act as companion secretary to person traveling here or abroad. Time unlimited, salary secondary. Address: Box 503, The New Republic.

SUMMER COTTAGES FOR RENT

Old New England home in Dorset, Vermont —10 airy, large rooms, 2 baths, electricity. One mile to field and golf club. Beautiful location on West Road. Reasonable Rent. Inquire: M. F. Gilbert, Dorset, Vermont. Phone 198-14.

KENNEBUNK BEACH, MAINE

Furnished modern cottage, six minutes from beach; near Webbannet Golf Links, 8 rooms, garage, screened piazza. For season or by month. Miss Marion W. Perkins, Kennebunk Beach, Maine.

FOR RENT

Greenwich Village: Charming 3-room apartments, artistic and different. Roof garden overlooking Hudson River. Very convenient to 9th Avenue L and Hudson Tube, $75. Apply Superintendent, 3 Weehawken Street (one block from Hudson River, between Christopher and 10th Streets).

Furnished Rural Cottage in New Jersey—40 minutes from Grand Central. Rent free to Gentile couple for services. Address: Box 506, The New Republic.

GRAPHOLOGIST

Do you take a business inventory and forget a personal one? Test yourself graphologically. An illuminating method. Send handwriting. Analysis, $1.00. Miss Florence Lyon, Box 286, Quincy, Mass.

GENERAL

REAL HARRIS TWEED
The aristocrats of all sports wear—direct from makers. Sample free. Suit-lengths by Mail. Carriage Paid.
NEWALL, 139 Stornoway, Scotland.

BOOKS

THE BOOKS YOU CAN'T GET ELSEWHERE

may be rented for a nominal fee. Members throughout the United States have access to a large collection of rare, scarce, out-of-print, strange and curious books; limited, privately-printed editions, unabridged translations and extraordinary new books. Please state occupation or profession when writing for information and lists.

Esoterika Biblion Society
45 West 45th Street, Dep't G-3 New York City

The books of

JOHN JAY CHAPMAN

For further particulars write to

A. S. LUSENBERG
156 Fifth Avenue New York City
Old and rare books

FIVE-LANGUAGES-IN-ONE

French-Spanish-German-Italian-English. Containing 5,000 practical words attractively arranged. Limited supply. $1.50. Order today. Universal Institute, 1265 Lexington Ave., (D12) New York.

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!

We hold 2,000,000 of the best books—new, second-hand, out-of-print, rare—all subjects. Also Sets of Authors. Catalogue free (25 issued). Outline requirements and interests. Books sent on approval. **FOYLES, Charing Cross Rd., London, England.**

LANGUAGES

FRENCH, SPANISH,
ITALIAN, GERMAN

Conversational method, Carefully selected Native teachers. Private lessons, 75c ,short course, 9 to 9 daily, 18th year.

FISHER'S SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES
1264 Lexington Avenue, N. W. Cor. 85th St.

FRENCH-SPANISH-ITALIAN

GERMAN. Private lessons 75c Daily 9-9). Native teachers. Interesting conversational method. 19th year. Also neglected English education.

UNIVERSAL SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES
1265 Lexington Ave., Northeast cor 85th St.

SCHOOLS

PLAYWRITING AT N.U.

Classes in playwriting, playshop production for promising manuscripts, walking rehearsals, etc. Competitive scholarships available. For catalog write:

THE DEAN
School of Speech and Theatre Arts
Evanston, Ill.

SCHOOL OF HORTICULTURE FOR WOMEN

FLORICULTURE, LANDSCAPE DESIGN, FRUIT GROWING, POULTRY, ETC.
Two-year Diploma Course begins September 16th. Excellent positions open to graduates Short Summer Course, August 1st to 29th.
Address, The Director, Box C, Ambler, Pa.

What Do You Want For Your Money?

If a detective story that will put your mind to sleep for two hours is worth two dollars—or one dollar—or two bits—how much should you pay for a book that will give you two months of absorbing and stimulating reading, and which will be equally alive and profitable two—or twenty—years from now?

THE RISE OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

By CHARLES A. BEARD *and* MARY BEARD

is such a book. When it was originally published in two volumes a great many people thought it was worth $12.50. It has been republished in a one volume edition of 1650 pages. Together with 52 weeks of THE NEW REPUBLIC it costs you only $6.00.

Do you know of a better six dollar's worth? Choose your method of payment.

The NEW REPUBLIC, 421 West 21st St., N.Y.C.

For the enclosed $3.00, enter my subscription to The NEW REPUBLIC, and send me "The Rise of American Civilization." I promise to pay in addition one dollar a month for three months.

Name .....

Address .....

In full .....

7-30-30

The NEW REPUBLIC, 421 West 21st St., N.Y.C.

For the enclosed $6.00 send me The NEW REPUBLIC for one year and "The Rise of American Civilization."

Name .....

Address .....

In full .....

7-30-30

Printed by STEINBERG PRESS, INC., 409 Pearl St., New York, N. Y.

INVESTMENT TRUSTS Gone Wrong!

by JOHN T. FLYNN

To be published July 31st in The New Republic's series of Dollar Books. Mr. Flynn's recent articles on the abuses that have characterized the exploitation of this new engine of capital control form the basis for a full-length book, with index. It contains hitherto unpublished material revealing the extent to which industrial ownership is passing into the hands of gigantic holding companies. Individual trusts are analyzed, for the prospective investor. Orders filled on day of publication.

THE NEW REPUBLIC, 421 West 21st Street, New York City.

For the attached ONE DOLLAR BILL send me postpaid *Investment Trusts Gone Wrong!*

NAME..... STREET.....

CITY..... STATE.....

7-30-30